NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

107

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

University of Alberta

# Human Rights and Inclusion--

# Reflections from an Ecosystems Perspective

by

Shirley Lister

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in

Special Education

Department of Educational Psychology

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall, 1999

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

*Your file Votre référence*

*Our file Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Biblicthèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-46876-3

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Shirley Jane Lister

Title of Thesis: Human Rights and Inclusion--

Reflections from an Ecosystems Perspective

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 1999

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise produced in any material form without the author's prior written permission.

Shirley J. Lister

11123-55 Avenue

Edmonton, Alberta T6H 0W9

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research on:

Sept. 24, 1999

The Circle

You have noticed
that everything an Indian does
is in a circle, and that is because the Power of
the World always works in circles, and everything tries
to be round. In the old days when we were a happy strong people,
all of our power came to us from the sacred hoop of the nation and so long
as the hoop was unbroken the people flourished. The flowering tree was the
living center of the hoop, and the circle of the four quarters nourished it. The east gave
peace and light, the south gave warmth, the west gave rain, and the
north with its cold and mighty wind gave strength and endurance. This knowledge came
to us from the outer world with our religion. Everything the
Power of the World does is done in a circle. The sky is round and I have heard
that the earth is round like a ball and so are all the stars. The Wind in its
greatest power, whirls. Birds make their nests in circles, for theirs is the same religion
as ours. The sun comes forth and goes down again in a circle. The
moon does the same, and both are round. Even the seasons form a great
circle in their changing, and always come back to where they were.
The life of a man is a circle from childhood to childhood, and so it is
in everything where power moves. Our tipis were round like
the nests of birds and these were always set in a circle,
the nation's hoop, a nest of many nests where
the Great Spirit meant us to hatch our children

(Black Elk in McLuhan (1977) Touch the Earth).

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled Human Rights and Inclusion– Reflections from an Ecosystems Perspective, submitted by Shirley Lister in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Special Education.

Dr. L. McDonald (Supervisor)
Department of Educational Psychology

Dr. L. Wilgosh
Department of Educational Psychology

Dr. F. Snart
Department of Educational Psychology

Dr. J. Goldberg
Department of Educational Psychology

Dr. R. Hayden
Department of Elementary Education

Dr. R. Brown

June 16/99
Date of Approval

## DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to three people--my son David, friend Ken Schildroth, and to the memory of my Grandmother Fairley.

From David, who entered my life at 6 years old--and wanted "Up, Mom", I have learned a lot (and will continue to do so), and have shared many 'forever' memories.

An unconditional friendship with Ken for several years is highly valued. His empowerment and belief in me to accomplish my athletic pursuits, and academic goals has nudged me to relentlessly continue towards my ideals and goals.

Memories and images of my grandmother are alive--for although she passed away when I was young, a connection was made with her. Spirited, with determination and courage to endure all that life might challenge her with. An independent female role model--an image to strive towards as I travel along my journey of life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Linda McDonald, my supervisor for her consistent support, time, and professionalism she has extended to me. Thanks to my committee members; Dr. Fern Snart, Dr. Lorraine Wilgosh, Dr. Jack Goldberg, and Dr. Ruth Hayden for their encouragement and enthusiasm about my travels and work.

Many thanks to Dr. Jane Watkinson for her continued feedback and support 'over the years'. Dr. Ted Wall, Dean of Education at McGill was extremely helpful in establishing a niche for me at McGill, and providing the connections with Dr. Evy Lusthaus and Dr. W. Smith at McGill. Much appreciation is extended to Nancy Travers, Principal of Hampstead School, the first "Success for All" program site in Canada.

Special thanks are extended to Dr. Cathie Mueleck, Director of Promotions at Ludwig Maximillions Universitaet in Muenchen, Herr Dr. Schaar, Minister of Education in Bavaria, Dr. Goetze at the University of Potsdam in Brandenburg, and Herr Heivepriem, School Director in Postsdam.

Thank you to all of the students and teachers with whom I shared over the last couple of years. Special thanks to the four students who shared their experiences of school with me for the third phase of this dissertation.

A personal thanks to my parents--for their continued support through the ups and downs of my pathway of life. Thank you to many friends and colleagues who have 'been there' unconditionally for me over the last couple of years. I hope some day to reciprocate in some way what you have done for me.

There are many people who have helped me along the path towards the accomplishment of this long-term goal. My thanks and appreciation are extended to all who helped, directed, supported, or empowered me as I traveled across Canada and Europe these last few years, exploring and seeking to share, and learn more about how children with special needs may be effectively and affectively included with their peers in school.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

Introduction ..... 1

The Development of Inclusive Policies ..... 2

Movement Towards Integration ..... 2

Impact of Human Rights and Ideologies on Inclusive Policies ..... 4

Provision of an Inclusive Curriculum ..... 6

The Classroom Atmosphere ..... 8

Student Characteristics ..... 8

The Use of an Ecological Framework to Evaluate Inclusive Systems ..... 9

An Ecosystems Framework and the Focus of this Inquiry ..... 11

References ..... 14

Chapter II

Towards Progressive Inclusion and Acceptance: A Comparison of the Trends Towards Inclusion in Canada and Germany

Abstract ..... 18

Spirals of Societal Response ..... 19

Sociological Similarities and Differences Through to the 20th Century ..... 21

Purpose of the Inquiry ..... 22

Rationale for the Selection of These Provinces/States ..... 23

Methods ..... 25

Discussion of the Findings ..... 27

Responses of the Four States/Provinces....27

Right to Attend School....27

Right to an Individualized Program Based on Identified Need....29

Right to Early Identification and Intervention....29

Right to a Written Education Plan....30

Right to Placement in the Least Restrictive Environment....31

Right to Ongoing Review and Assessment....31

Right of Students with Special Needs to have Needs

Represented through Guaranteed Due Process....32

Right of Access to Records and Confidentiality....33

Legislation should be Child-Centered....34

Funding for Special Needs....34

Comparison of the Trends in Educational Policies between

the States and Provinces....34

Towards Progressive Inclusion and Acceptance....36

Summary....38

References....40

Appendix 1: Ten Educational Rights of All Children....45

Chapter III

Effectiveness of the Success for All Program Model

Abstract....49

Overview of the Success for All Program Model....50

Early Intervention.....51

Efficacy of Early Intervention Programs.....52

Success for All--A School-Based Early Intervention Program.....53

Validity Threats to the Success for All Program Intervention.....56

Components of Internal Validity.....57

Statistical Significance of Reading Scores Obtained for Success for All.....58

Affective Appraisals about the Success for All Program Intervention.....62

External Validity.....63

Framework of Causal Inferences of Intervention Measures.....63

Components of the Causal Framework Regarding Success for All.....64

Specificity.....64

Social Support.....64

Child and Family Characteristics.....65

Internal Validity.....65

Dependent Measures.....66

Functional Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables.....67

Summary.....69

References.....71

Chapter IV

Program Interventions to Support Inclusive Practices:

Reading Recovery and Success for All Compared

Abstract.....76

Reading as the Key to Success in School.....78

Early Difficulties may Lead to Long-Term Weaknesses....78
Accompanying Affective Difficulties....79
Competencies of a Good Reader....79
Fluency....80
World Knowledge....80
Flexible Strategy Use....80
Motivation....80
Continued Reading....80
How We Become Proficient Readers....81
Instructional Programs to Support Children-at-Risk....82
Effectiveness of School-Based Early Intervention Programs....83
Provision of School-Based Early Intervention Programs
to Support Inclusion....84
Reading Recovery Intervention Program....84
Success for All Intervention Program....85
Comparison of the Efficacy of the Program Elements of
Success for All and Reading Recovery....86
Development and Growth of the Programs in Canada....87
Teacher Training and Support....90
Theoretical Perspectives....91
Methods of Assessment and Instructional Intervention....92
The Tutoring Component....96
Parental Involvement....97

Efficacy and Longitudinal Benefits of Reading Recovery and Success for All.....99

Summary.....100

References.....102

Chapter V

Narratives of Youth with ADHD in Differing Educational and Cultural Settings: Their Experiences of School

Abstract.....108

The Development of Inclusion as a Reflection of Society's Values.....110

The Salamanca Declaration on Inclusion.....111

The Status of Inclusion in Canada and Germany.....112

The Nature of Inclusionary Practices.....113

Approach to the Inquiry.....115

Methodology.....116

Overview of a Qualitative Approach.....116

Assumptions and Limitations.....116

Trustworthiness.....117

Ethical Considerations.....119

Selection of Participants.....119

The Interview Process.....120

Data Analysis.....121

Findings.....123

Ian from Alberta.....124

Jean from Quebec.....128

Michel from Brandenburg.....131

Wolfgang from Bavaria.....135

Discussion and Reflections About Students' Perceptions of their Experiences.....138

Differing Environments.....139

Justification to Attend School and Get a Job.....139

Need for Effective Teachers to "Believe In" Each Student.....140

Wish to Minimize Peer Rejection and Ridicule.....142

Inclusion and 'Being Included'.....143

Summary.....145

References.....147

Chapter VI

General Discussion and Conclusions.....152

An Ecosystems Approach.....153

The Ideology of Inclusion.....154

Relevance of the Salamanca Declaration.....154

Salamanca as the Framework of Inclusion.....155

Levels of an Inclusive Ecosystems Model from a School-based Perspective.....155

A Macrosystems Analysis.....155

Analysis of Each of the Mesosystem Levels.....155

The Microsystem Level.....158

Analysis Within and Between Ecosystems.....159

The Ecosystem of Quebec.....160

Alberta's Ecosystem.....161

Ecosystem of Brandenburg.....162

Bavaria's Ecosystem.....163

Summary.....166

Implications for Teaching and Learning.....167

Humanism and Inclusion in Teacher Education.....170

Summary of Ideas, Ideals, and Future Directions.....172

References.....175

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Summary of States' and Provinces' Responses to the 10 Educational Rights of all Children.....28

Table 3.1 Validity Threats to the Success for All Program Intervention.....59

Table 3.2 Efficacy of the Success for All program Model.....68

Table 4.1 Reading Recovery and Success for All Compared.....88

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

> Every child can learn. That so many students fail to attain the necessary skills reflects not the incapacity of the students but the incapacity of schools to meet the needs of every child (Slavin & Madden, 1989, p.4).

From a philosophical and humanistic perspective, all children are special. All children have strengths and weaknesses, inter- and intra-individual differences. However, it is children who may have difficulty in reaching their potential, due to intellectual, emotional, physical, or social reasons, and who require special supports during part or all of their lives in order to reach their potential that we are concerned about.

Society's attitude towards individuals with special needs has been complex, determined at the time by the dominant culture, religion, governing body, and socio-economic conditions. Support and education for children with special needs has therefore tended to follow historical trends.

This chapter describes the movement towards inclusion, and the impact of human rights upon the development of policies to support inclusion. A discussion of the multifaceted needs of children today suggests a need for preventive intervention programs to support inclusive practices. The use of an ecosystems framework as Brofenbrenner (1979) theorized, to support an analysis of inclusion is then highlighted.

This inquiry utilized an ecosystems framework as Brofenbrenner (1979) theorized, to illustrate the levels of systems involved, from policies through to practice. Each of the levels of systems--referred to as phases--was described from a school-based

inclusion perspective. Four academic papers were written which report on each of the phases of the inquiry. Two of these papers have been published in academic journals, and the other two will be submitted for consideration in the near future.

## The Development of Inclusive Policies

Traditionally, education for students with special needs was provided in segregated schools, classes, or institutions. Special centres were initiated by voluntary organizations, and were maintained by governments, as they, over time, assumed increased responsibility for the education of all children (Hunt, 1984).

Jenkinson (1997) suggested three reasons regarding anticipated advantages for establishing segregated educational settings for children with special needs. First, it was suggested that it was more economical to place students with special needs that were similar in one, or a limited number of settings as compared to a diversity of settings. In that way, professional support and therapeutic services could be more easily accessed. The second reason was that a special school, with smaller class settings, was thought to be more supportive, and could more effectively offer individualized support. Third, it was perceived that placing students with special needs in regular classrooms could impede, or negatively affect the learning of non-handicapped peers.

## Movement Towards Integration

Jenkinson (1997) suggested that integration first originated in Scandinavia, and took place for individuals with intellectual handicaps who at that time received services within institutions. Wolfensberger (1972) brought the principles of normalization and integration to North America. He defined normalization as "the utilization of means which are as culturally normative as possible, in order to establish and/or maintain

personal behaviors and characteristics which are as culturally normative as possible" (p.28). Wolfensberger (1972) conceptualized that the result of normalization is integration, which potentially maximizes a person's participation in the mainstream of society. From an educational perspective therefore, normalization would suggest that an individual with special needs would attend a regular school, and be in a class with peers of the same chronological age. The program would be adapted only as necessary, and would parallel the regular curriculum in theme and content as much as possible. Integration would occur when children attended and participated to their fullest potential in a regular classroom interacting with their age-group peers. Dunn (1968), another mentor of integration, emphasized that integration resulted in positive changes, which included: (a) peers maintaining their previous academic standings, and (b) the development of individualized curricula, which facilitated the participation of children with special needs. Reactions to Dunn's (1968) arguments were positive and were influential in development of Public Law 94-127 in the United States. The concept and practice of integration continued to develop through the 1980's and early 1990's across the United States and Canada.

Following the implementation of the Canadian Constitution 1982, Charter of Rights and Freedoms in Canada, and international charters such as the Salamanca Declaration on Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994), the integration of children with special needs was increasingly perceived as a fundamental human right. The ideology of education and society, as suggested by the Salamanca Declaration was focussed towards the inclusion and acceptance of all individuals. As Canada ratified its participation towards this Declaration, the term "inclusion" rather than "integration" has

been utilized to encompass the scope of this ideology. The Salamanca Declaration advocated that all children must have access to regular schools, which should provide an effective program to meet the needs of each individual. It was noted that regular schools with an inclusive ideology provide the most effective learning environment for all children, as they facilitate an awareness and acceptance of individual differences, build co-operative processes, efficiency, and cost effectiveness of the total educational structure (UNESCO, 1994, p.10). The Salamanca statement and framework on special needs education (UNESCO), documented that the goal of the 1990's would be to address and prioritize a systemic change of educational provisioning towards inclusive schools. It was suggested that this would provide all children with the opportunity to achieve towards their own individual potential, and create a welcoming atmosphere for all (UNESCO, 1994).

## Impact of Human Rights Documentations and Ideologies on Inclusive Practices

A number of events in the 1980's and 1990's influenced Canadians, and the rest of the world to reflect upon the provision of educational services for children with special needs. In 1981, the International Year of Disabled People was celebrated. In the same year the United Nations Declaration included the right for students with special needs to receive an education that would enable them to develop to their full potential (Herr, 1993). This right was embodied as well in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1990 (Herr, 1993). Then in 1994 as discussed above, the Salamanca Declaration advocated that inclusion must be seen as the educational means for all children.

From a national perspective, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms stated in section 15 (1), that:

> Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination, and in particular without discrimination based on race, national, or ethnic origin, color, religion, sex, age, or mental, or physical disability (Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms 1982, 1986, p. 238).

The Charter, in the next section, pointed out the legal continuance of all affirmative action programs for individuals in Canada with special needs (Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982, 1986, pp. 239-40). The establishment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms mandated that the provinces were no longer in complete control of their educational legislation. It was stated that law at a provincial level inconsistent with the Charter was considered to have no effect insofar as it was in disagreement with the Charter (Anderson, 1986, p.189).

It is difficult to determine what the direct impact of these declarations regarding human rights may have been on the educational experiences of children with special needs. Additionally, there have been many interpretations of what the 'right to an education' from an inclusive perspective actually means. Potentially, for advocates of inclusion, the right to an education for children with special needs has been interpreted in that every child had the right to be educated in a regular classroom, in their neighborhood school. Alternatively, it was interpreted that parents (and in some cases--students) had the right to choose between regular and special educational settings.

It has been documented however, that the actual influence on practice may be limited unless it is directly concerned with education (Black-Branch, 1993). Black-Branch (1993) reviewed the views of school administrators regarding the impact of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms on educational services for children with special needs. The majority of administrators felt the Charter was important in expanding the rights of students with special needs, and influencing policy changes at provincial and board levels. It was generally felt that there was some impact as well on special education practices. However, due to the varied provincial legislative policies (Winzer, 1994), there was still a lack of clarity as to the meaning of the rights in practice (Black-Branch, 1993).

## Provision of an Inclusive Curriculum

A recent report by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 1996), suggested that 15 to 30 percent of children and youth are at-risk of failing in school, and that learning and behavior problems are affecting increasingly younger children. Universally, problems have been encountered in schools where children come to school hungry, emotionally and physically abused and neglected, potentially destructive and violent in their behavior, with physical and/or learning disabilities, language and cultural needs, and health or medical needs (OECD; Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 1992). It is difficult to fathom how teachers can meet the varied educational, social, emotional, and at times, medical needs of all children within a regular school setting, when there may be up to 30 percent of children at risk, due to one or more of the factors stated above. Mahwhinney (1994) suggested that on their own, schools cannot effectively address the multifaceted needs of the large

numbers of children who are at-risk, due to the above factors, of not achieving their high school diploma, or maintaining a long-term job . In order to try to effectively meet the social, emotional, and educational needs of children-at-risk, there must be a coordination of support services provided at the school level (OECD).

Slavin and Madden (1989) in their review of programs designed to support children-at-risk (of achieving their high school diploma or maintaining a job), described three principles to effectively facilitate successful inclusion. These principles included preventive services or programs, effective focussed teaching methods, and intensive supplementary or remedial programming for those children who may need long-term support. It was strongly suggested that intensive support services in the early grades would facilitate or eliminate the need for remedial services later on for most children (Clay, 1985). Preventive programs generally focus on providing enriched preschool, or kindergarten programs, and/or intensive support at a grade one level. Slavin and Madden suggested that one of the best ways to reduce the numbers of children who will need remedial services later was to utilize instructional methods which had been demonstrated previously to facilitate accelerated student achievement. Examples of these types of methods would be continuous progress programs, or cooperative learning (p.9). If additional support was needed later, supplementary or remedial programs would be provided on a one-to-one tutoring basis, according to the individual needs of the child, outside of the regular classroom. This support would then be remedial in nature, rather than preventive.

The Success for All program (Slavin, Dolan, & Madden, 1994) is one example of a program intervention which includes the elements above, and includes elements of

early intensive support services which are preventive in nature, focussed teaching methods, as well as intensive remedial support services as needed. The program model has been demonstrated to be highly successful, and has been replicated in over 300 schools in North America (Slavin, Dolan, & Madden).

## The Classroom Atmosphere

Teachers' roles within an inclusive classroom are multi-faceted. They must be able to take on not only instructional challenges, to adapt the curriculum to the needs of their students, but as well have learned to oversee teacher assistants and volunteers. Additionally, teachers need to realize that they are the ones responsible to make changes in the educational goals, and to facilitate acceptance of students with special needs in their classes.

It has frequently been found that teachers, who initially may have felt apprehensive about inclusion, reported a change in their attitudes after they had been provided with an opportunity to work with a child with special needs (Giangreco, Dennis, Cloniger, Edelman, & Schattman, 1993). Jenkinson (1997) suggested that positive teacher attitudes are essential for a successful inclusive setting. She also suggested that principals' attitudes are important to ensure a supportive climate and that adequate resources are provided.

## Student Characteristics

There has been much attention focussed on the effects of the inclusion of children with special needs on the attitudes of teachers and peers. It has been found that intellectual and personal factors were important for the success of all students, including those with special needs (Jenkinson, 1997). One group of individuals who may have

experienced the greatest difficulties in inclusive settings in North America include individuals with externalizing behavioral disorders (Jenkinson). It has frequently been perceived that students with externalizing behavior disorders are one of the most difficult groups of children to successfully include because of their potential to disrupt a class. Unfortunately these types of behaviors facilitate attention, but attention from a negative perspective, when the majority of these students are actually craving positive attention, but do not know how to seek it appropriately (Douglas, 1984).

Studies (e.g. Jenkinson, 1997) have demonstrated increased positive outcomes (academic and social) for students with and without special needs in inclusive settings. However, the heterogeneous needs of students require educators to be acutely sensitive to cues about students' lives or home environments which could affect their learning on a short-term basis, and self- esteem on a long-term basis. There is a need for increased sensitivity of the individual needs of children, and how their personal traits and experiences affect their interactions with others, and new situations in the classroom, and school environment.

## The Use of an Ecological Framework to Evaluate Inclusive Systems

The use of an ecological approach to analyze educational systems facilitates a holistic awareness of how the many variables--from the national level educational policies, to a school's and classroom's physical structure and appearance, to a teacher's personal traits, teaching experience, and teaching methods--all interact to influence the experiences of each child in a classroom. Inclusion of a child or children with special needs increases the (already) diverse learning needs of the children in a classroom.

Uri Bronfenbrenner (1979) theorized an ecological framework of human development which potentially could be helpful in evaluating research on inclusion. Brofenbrenner stressed the importance of children having a positive self-image, with a sense that their differences are appreciated and valued, and that they have respect for themselves and for others. His conceptualization of an ecological framework incorporates the many layers of systems in society which interconnect to impact on a child's development, self-image, and learning.

With reference to education for children with special needs, the outer-most layer was termed a macro-system as it represented policies and ideologies of a province, or state. The next layer, the meso-system level, included the policies and program development at a local or municipal level--represented through the provision of school boards in Canada. An exo-system, the subsequent level, included the programs, and environments in which the child was involved at the school or community, and the relationships between members within. The relationship between the parents, the educator, their collaborative involvement, and decision-making would also be a component of this level of the system. The innermost level, the micro-system, would have included a child's immediate environment which was influenced by the exo-system members--family members, relationships, and the home environment. The micro-system also included the immediate classroom environment at school--peer relationships, the child-teacher, and teacher-child dyad, as well as the effectiveness of the match of the instructional pedagogy and curricula with the learning needs of the child.

## An Ecosystems Framework and the Focus of this Inquiry

Canada and Germany represent two developed countries, who through their participation and ratification of the Salamanca Declaration in 1994, made a commitment to work towards the creation of inclusive schools to meet the needs of all children. Hence, in order to effectively assess the status of inclusion in each of these countries, the comprehensiveness of provincial/state policy developments, completeness of municipal/board level regulations, acceptance of all children in a classroom, and empowerment of each child to work towards his/her potential must all be considered. In order to be able to effectively assess the differences in educational policies in Canada and Germany, two provinces in Canada; Alberta and Quebec, and two states in Germany; Bavaria and Brandenburg were selected for comparison. The rationale for the selection of these provinces and states was based on geographical distances, as well as political, and historical diversity.

The aim of the inquiry was to assess inclusion from an ecological systems perspective. Therefore it was divided into three components, each of which reviewed the different system levels within an ecological framework of inclusion. The goal was to present the conclusions of each of the three sub-components in a paper thesis format. Each of the papers would then be prepared for publication in academic journals.

The first phase of the inquiry reflected upon inclusion from a macro-system level. Legislation and educational policies affecting the educational rights of children with special needs in two provinces in Canada; Quebec, and Alberta, and two states in Germany; Brandenburg, and Bavaria, were evaluated according to the 10 Educational Rights of all Children, as developed by the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada

(Making the Most of the Law, 1993), and the Salamanca Declaration on Inclusion (UNESCO, 1994). A discussion of the first phase focussed on the evaluation of the educational policies according to the 10 Rights of all Children, was described in a paper titled "Towards progressive inclusion and acceptance: A Comparison of the trends toward inclusion in Canada and Germany". It was published in the International Journal of Special Education, 13 (1), 84-101.

The second phase of the study, reviewed inclusion from an exo- and meso-systems level (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Two examples of program interventions as a means to support inclusion were reviewed with the intent to provide educators and administrators with information to help them potentially select one or the other for their school or program. They include systems elements at an exo- and meso-systems level, as the program was implemented at a meso-system level, and involved the input of teachers, administrator, and parents to provide a successful experience for the child.

The first element of this phase involved the analysis of an early elementary program intervention termed Success for All (Slavin, Dolan, & Madden, 1994). The Success for All program intervention, designed to support children-at-risk in inclusive schools has demonstrated high levels of success, and has been replicated in over 300 sites in North America. This program intervention was assessed for its effectiveness based on a framework established by Dunst, Synder, and Mankinen (1989). This paper titled "The Effectiveness of the success for all program model" was published in Exceptionality Education Canada, 7 , (1&2), 69-86.

The second element of this phase involved a comparison of two intervention programs, the Success for All program intervention, and the Reading Recovery Program

intervention (Clay, 1985), both of which were designed to support children-at-risk (for academic and occupational success) in a regular classroom setting. This paper documented the strengths and weaknesses of each program with respect to the program focus and content, and teacher training and support. It will be submitted for review for publication in an academic journal in the near future.

The third and final phase of the study reviewed inclusion from a micro-systems level. One child from each of the four different states and provinces in Germany and Canada, was selected to describe his/her experiences of school. A narrative analysis of each of these students' experiences was then documented in this final paper. The paper additionally reflected upon the impact of the policies and varied program interventions on students' perceptions of their experiences in elementary school. This paper will be submitted for publication in an academic journal as well.

In summary, through an ecosystems framework of inclusion, this inquiry purported to reflect on: (a) Provincial and state level policy developments in Canada and Germany, (b) program support models designed to support the learning needs of children-at-risk in inclusive settings, and (c) the school experiences of children-at-risk in each of the diverse educational and cultural settings. The format of a paper thesis facilitated dissemination and sharing of the results of the inquiry. It is hoped that through the comparisons of inclusive policies, assessment of program support models, and narrative analyses of the school experiences of students-at-risk, a broader perspective of inclusion and its complexities may be acquired, facilitating a greater awareness, acceptance, and understanding of the needs and rights of all children in education.

## References

Anderson, J. (1986). Effects of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms on provincial school legislation. In M.E. Manley-Casimir & T. Sussel (Eds.) Courts in the classroom: Education and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (pp. 183-202). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited.

Black-Branch, J. (1993). The nexus between policy and practice regarding special needs students: The Experiences and opinions of Canada's school administrators. British Columbia Journal of Special Education, 17, 148-156.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The Ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982, (1986). In M. E. Manley-Casimir & T. Sussel (Eds.), Courts in the classroom: Education and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (pp. 237-245). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited.

Clay, M. (1985). The Early detection of reading difficulties, (3rd ed). Auckland: Heinemann.

Douglas, V. (1984). The psychological process implicated in A.D.D. In L. Bloomingdale, (Ed.). Attention deficit disorder: Diagnostic cognitive and therapeutic understanding (pp. 149-156). New York: Spectrum Publications.

Dunn, L. (1968). Special education for the mildly retarded--Is much of it justifiable? Exceptional Children, 35, 5-22.

Dunst, C., Snyder, S., & Mankinen, M. (1989). Efficacy of early intervention. In M. Wang, M. Reynolds, & H. Walberg, (Eds.), Handbook of special education. Low incidence conditions. (Vol. 3.) Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Giangreco, M., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S., & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've counted Jan." Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. Exceptional Children, 59, 359-372.

Herr, S. (1993). Special education as a human and legal right. In P. Mittler, R. Brouillette, & D.Harris, (Eds.), Special Needs Education: World Yearbook of Education, (pp. 38-50). London: Kogan Page.

Hunt, L. (1985). Building a vision: Public education for children with developmental handicaps. Ontario: Ministry of Employment and Immigration, Canada.

Jenkinson, J. (1997). Mainstream or special? Educating students with disabilities. London: Routledge.

Mahwhinney, H. B. (1994). Discovering shared values: Ecological models to support interagency collaboration. In Adler, L., & Garder, S., (Eds.), The Politics of linking schools and social services. London, England: Falmer.

Making the most of the law: Education and the child with disabilities ,(1993). Ontario: Learning Disabilities Association of Canada.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1996). Successful services for our children and families at risk. Paris: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation OECD.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Education (1992). Integrated school-based services for children and families. Regina, Saskatchewan.

Slavin, R., Dolan, L., & Madden, N. (1994). Scaling up: Lessons learned in the dissemination of Success for All. Baltimore: John Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Slavin, R., & Madden, N. (1989). What works for students at risk: A research synthesis. Educational Leadership, p. 4-13.

UNESCO, (1994). The Salamanca statement on special needs education. Paris: UNESCO.

Winzer, M. (1994). Canada. In K. Mazurek, & M. Winzer, (Eds.), Comparative studies in special education, pp. 370-378. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Wolfensberger, W. (1972). Normalization. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

RUNNING HEAD: Trends in Canada and Germany

# CHAPTER II

# TOWARDS PROGRESSIVE INCLUSION AND ACCEPTANCE:

## A COMPARISON OF THE TRENDS TOWARDS INCLUSION IN CANADA AND GERMANY

A version of this chapter has been published. [ (1998). Towards progressive inclusion and acceptance: A Comparison of the trends towards inclusion in Canada and Germany. International Journal of Special Education, 13 , (1), 84-101.]

## Abstract

This paper reviewed the trends of Special Education in Canada and Germany. Over the last several years there has been increased concern in Canada and Germany to provide educational services to all children, including those with special needs. The value of services in special classes and schools has been questioned, and particular emphasis has been placed on the inclusion of all children in the regular classroom. However neither Canada nor Germany has nationally operated offices of education. Hence provinces and states may or may not develop policies concerning education for children with special needs. This paper specifically compared and contrasted the situation within and between two provinces in Canada; Alberta and Quebec, with two states in Germany; Bavaria and Brandenburg. The situation was evaluated according to the 10 Educational Rights of All Children, as developed by the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada in 1993. As well, the situation was evaluated according to the trends which have evolved over the years along a continuum of exclusion towards inclusion.

"Hopefully by the year 2000 there will be no more special education, but only an educational system that serves all children" (Forest, 1985, p.40). Society's response to an issue over time could be represented in the form of a pendulum, inferring that attitudes swing back and forth from one side to another, the sides representing opposing ends of a continuum.

The pendulum will never swing back to where it came from, as things can never return to the same starting point. Although it may seem as though society's response can return to what it was previously, it never really can. Society's response to a specific issue which can be termed a trend, will actually over time spiral around a continuum. Initially the spiral is wide, at times the path is elliptical, but eventually the path narrows as it approaches the end of the continuum.

## Spirals of Societal Response

The existing issue of special education and its relation to regular education has been and continues to be an issue of debate. Stainbeck and Stainbeck (1986) and Skrtic (1991), suggested that the issue is one of a merger of special education and regular education into a unified education system, rather than the present dual system of education. Over the years the trend has been addressed; from exclusion, to categorization, to mainstreaming, integration, and most recently, inclusion.

Lipsky and Gardner (1996) suggested rather than fixing the current educational system, what is needed is "broad based educational structuring" (p.3). They continued to suggest that through the restructuring of education a better society for all would be created. "...if the handicap is a function of a disabling environment (physical or

attitudinal) and if disability is a social construct then the changes must come in both the physical environment and social relationships" (p.3).

Both of these issues are essential components in the remaking of societies world-wide. Barton and Landman (1993) stated their perceptions regarding the issue of integration, in that "...the issue of integration is an important one. It provides an opportunity for raising serious questions about the kind of society and the nature and functions of schooling" (p.41).

Skrtic (1991) described educational equity in post-industrial society as "...learning collaboratively with and from persons with varying interests, abilities, skills, and cultural perspectives, and taking responsibility for one's own learning and that of others. Ability grouping, and tracking have no place in such a system" (p.181). Hence, these issues extend beyond education to the nature of society--who is to be included, and who is not. Traditionally individuals have been barred from public education and societal participation due to race, gender, religion, class, and physical, or intellectual abilities (Lipsky & Gartner, 1996). Thus, society's educational trend at times has represented exclusion for certain individuals. It is hoped finally, that the trend is spiraling slowly towards an inclusive educational system for all.

For the most part, in North America we can say that formal barriers have been removed, that all children may attend public schools, and all citizens of North America may vote. However is this trend demonstrated world-wide? What is the world-view? Are we spiraling in sync towards the universal acceptance and accessible environment for all, or are differing views towards inclusion presented in differing societies at this point in time?

According to Burrell and Morgan (1979), two major intellectual traditions have influenced social sciences for the last two centuries They suggested that western civilization has focussed on logical "positivism", which "...reflects the attempt to apply models and the methods of the natural sciences to study the human affairs. It treats the world as if it were a natural world, adopting a realist approach..." (p.7). It was then stated that the opposing subjectivist position is German idealism, which is based on the premise that "The ultimate reality of the universe lies in the spirit or idea rather than the data of sense perception..." (p.7).

Obviously the social professions draw their knowledge claims from theoretical premises. Hence will we see differing educational policies and practices between the western and eastern hemispheres? How will differing educational policies, if any, be reflected in educational practices, and societal inclusion? Will the spiral towards inclusion, as suggested earlier, follow the same path for the eastern and western hemispheres?

## Sociological Similarities and Differences Through to the 20th Century

Throughout the 19th century, and early 20th, through wars and the early postwar era, Germany's and Canada's responses to the education of individuals with special needs seemed to be following similar spiralling pathways. Both countries had experienced an era of rebuilding and remediation; as specialized schools and institutions had been built, and teaching had been focussed on the correction and 'cure' of disabilities. This period was followed in both countries by a period of exclusion and alienation following the world wars, when individuals were placed in institutions and

society focussed on economic needs (e.g., Hunt, 1985; Muth, 1996; Myschker, 1996; & Wolfensburger, 1975). This continued through the 1950's and early 1960's. It was then with the post-war boom that social service initiatives were expanded, and again a spiral shift took place as public interest and attention into the situation of children with special needs brought about changes which resulted in increased societal awareness and acceptance of all individuals.

Canada and Germany represent two industrialized countries in the world. Germany however, has seen much greater political strife than has Canada, and the former East Germany suffered through societal segregation and repression following the second World War until 1989. How have these factors influenced the educational policies and practices?

## Purpose of the Inquiry

The purpose of this inquiry was to explore the differences between the present educational legislation and policies for children with special needs in Canada and Germany. In order to be able to effectively note the similarities and differences in educational policies and structures in Canada and Germany, two states in Germany: Bavaria and Brandenburg; and two provinces in Canada: Alberta and Quebec, were selected for comparison. The rationale for the selection of these specific states and provinces was based upon geographical distances and political/historical diversity. This is further discussed in a subsequent section of this paper.

Prior to the inquiry questions that were asked included:

1. Will Alberta, Quebec and Bavaria demonstrate a more progressive approach to

inclusion than will Brandenburg?

2. Will Quebec's desire for 'uniqueness' and autonomy have negatively affected its approach to inclusion, relative to Alberta or Bavaria?

3. Will Bavaria, a traditional and stable state demonstrate the most progressive approach to inclusion?

Rationale for the Selection of these Provinces/States

Theoretically, Canada and Germany demonstrate parallels regarding the legislation of education of children with special needs. Neither Canada nor Germany have federally operated offices of Education. Thus provinces or states may or may not develop policies concerning the educational needs of children with special needs.

However, the Canadian School Act sets the theme to enforce accessible education for children-at-risk, as it states that each school board must organize the means for instructing children who require special support. (Canadian School Executive, 1985, p.3). As well, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982 (1986), section 15, stated that every individual is equal before and under the law, and every individual is to be protected from discrimination. Factors that may not be discriminated against include physical and mental disabilities. This holds implications for the education of children with special needs ( MacKay, 1986 ).

In 1973 the German government put forth a statement (Deutschen Bildungsrat, 1974) which suggested that integration is to be favored over segregation. In some states this led to special schools and regular schools developing measures for integrative

support, whereas in others segregation was still favored over integration. There developed a continuum of ways of thinking and services, dependent upon the individual state.

The comparison of Alberta , Quebec, Bavaria, and Brandenburg was formulated for a number of reasons. Alberta and Quebec were selected for contrast according to the following justification. First, Quebec has legislation mandating provisions for the education of children with special needs (Anderson, 1986). Alberta continues to function under "permissive" legislation, in that all school boards are not mandated to provide appropriate education in their home district (Anderson, 1986). Educational policies are likely to reflect this difference. Second, the two provinces are geographically distant, potentially resulting in divergent perspectives of education. Third, Quebec has traditionally been known for its desire for uniqueness and autonomy, which may potentially yield a different perspective/model towards the education of children-at-risk. Fourth, both provinces have seen a development and increase of services over the last fifteen or so years. The reason for this development is uncertain, as potentially it has stemmed from a number of factors including; needs demonstrated in the 'field', continued development of appropriate educational principles, or increased awareness of children's rights.

Bavaria and Brandenburg were selected for comparison from a similar perspective to Alberta and Quebec in Canada. First, they are geographically distant in Germany--Brandenburg is in the north, and Bavaria is in the south. Second, the two states offer different legislation perspectives for the education of children-at-risk (OECD, 1996) Third, until 1989, Brandenburg was under communist regime. Thus,

over the last few years the state as a whole has undergone many changes and developments. It was anticipated that the differing political, social, and cultural environments would provide an enlightening comparison of trends in the four states and provinces.

## Methods

The aim of this study was to gain an increased understanding of the educational policies and structures for children with special needs in Canada and Germany. Hence a structured interview approach was utilized in order to gain a greater understanding of the picture within each state or province. A combination of measures was utilized to gather information regarding the educational policies and structures for children with special needs in these four provinces/states. Structured interviews were conducted with ministry officials, university professors, educators and parents. Legal documents, and policy statements, as well as journal and newspaper articles were reviewed for information about education for children with special needs. Visitation to program sites, conference presentations, and networking in various forms formulated the basis for data collection.

The question evolved as to how to organize the information in order to document and compare relevant points towards inclusive education for all children. In 1992, the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada undertook a "Vision Workshop" to analyze all existing legislation and common law, and the extent to which the right to educational services appropriate to individual needs is guaranteed (Making the most of

the law: Education and the child with disabilities, 1993). It was determined that the right to an education means that:

> Every person has the right to an individualized education program with all of the technical, human, transportation and financial resources to support the program, including identification processes, all of which shall be utilized to commensurate with the unique needs and optimum potential of the individual (p. 8).

In addition, the Association formulated a list of 10 Educational Rights for All Children, which were designed to provide the basis for inclusive education. These rights were to correlate with the principles of 'Inclusive Education' as were defined in the Salamanca Declaration on Inclusion, formulated from the UNESCO World conference in 1994 (Eberwein, 1996). These 10 rights are as follows:

1. Right to attend school.
2. Right of each student to an individualized education plan, based on identified need.
3. Right to early identification and educational intervention.
4. Right to a written individual education plan.
5. Right to placement in the least restrictive environment.
6. Right to ongoing review and assessment.
7. Right of students-at-risk to have their interests represented through guaranteed due process.
8. Right of access to records and confidentiality.
9. Legislation should be child-centered.

10. Adequate funding for special needs.

(Making the Most of the Law: Education and the Child with Disabilities, 1993, p.14-17). A description of each of these rights is included in the Appendix. These 10 rights formulated the basis for information collected at the interviews. It is against these ten rights for inclusive education that the four provinces/states were evaluated.

## Discussion of the Findings

There have been many changes over the last fifteen or so years in special education in Canada and Germany. Changes in legislation have resulted in changes in societal attitudes as well. As stated earlier, the present legislation and educational policies are presented according to the 10 Educational Rights of All Children (Making the most of the law: Education and the child with disabilities, 1993).

### Responses of the Four States/Provinces

Following is a commentary on the response of the four states and provinces to the educational rights described earlier. This commentary is based on the interpretation of provincial school acts, interviews, and articles, listed in the References section. Summary responses are presented in Table 2.1.

Right to attend school. The Provincial and State Acts of Alberta, Quebec, and Brandenburg guarantee all individuals the right to attend school (Anderson, 1986; Eberwein, 1996). The Education Act of Brandenburg states that each child has the right of an appropriate education to be able to reach his/her individual level of learning. It

Table 2.1

Summary of States' and Provinces' Responses to the 10 Educational Rights of All Children.

| | Alberta | Quebec | Bavaria | Brandenburg |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Right to attend school | yes | yes | partially | yes |
| 2. Right to individualized education program | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 3. Right to early intervention | partially | partially | yes | yes |
| 4. Right to a written education plan | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 5. Right to least restrictive environment | partially | yes | no | yes |
| 6. Right to ongoing review and assessment | partially | yes | partially | partially |
| 7. Rights represented through guaranteed due process | yes | yes | no | yes |
| 8. Right of access to records and confidentiality | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 9. Legislation should be child-centered | partially | yes | no | yes |
| 10. Funding for special needs | yes | yes | yes | yes |

states that there must be a continuum of services in order to meet all students' needs; however, those students with special needs shall have the right to go to a regular school. Berlin Law, as of March, 1996, states that it is the educational responsibility of regular schools to include children with special needs (Eberwein, 1996). All children in Bavaria have the right to attend school--although the type of school, a regular or special school- will be determined by a committee of specialists. Children with an intellectual handicap, severe learning disability, or behavioral problem do not have the right to attend regular public schools. They have the right to attend school, although not the right to choose what type of school. If children attend a public school, it must be a special school, and there is no opportunity for an appeal on the part of the parent or student (Schaar, personal communication, 1997).

Right to an individualized education program based on identified need. The Alberta School Act (section 30) provides for students with special needs to have an individual education program appropriate to their needs. However there is no clear definition of appropriate which leaves this term subject to interpretation. Quebec's Education Act (section 47) gives each student the right to an individualized education plan according to his/her needs (Smith, 1994). There may again be inconsistencies of services provided as services are delivered at board level, which may vary from board to board. It is emphasized in the educational act in Brandenburg that each child must have an individual program in order to meet his/her potential (Eberwein, 1996). In Bavaria all children have the right to an individualized education plan based on their identified

need (Empfehlungen zur Sonderpaedagogischen Forderung in den Schulen in der Bunderepublik Deutschland, 1994).

Right to early identification and intervention. Previously in Alberta and Quebec, it was not legislated that children have the right to early assessment and intervention. In Alberta however, in 1993, an Office of the Commissioner of Services for Children was set up to focus on integrated, accessible and community managed service delivery, and a number of sites were set up as pilot sites for evaluation purposes. Increasingly more emphasis then is being placed on the importance of early assessment and intervention (Canadian Education Association, 1996). In Quebec, changes to the early education intervention policy were recently mandated (1996), and as part of major education reforms, an integrated policy to cover the needs of all children is being developed. Priority is being given to children-at-risk, and extended to all on an as-needed basis (Canadian Education Association, 1996). Children in Bavaria and Brandenburg have the right for early assessment and diagnosis from a medical perspective. They must follow the regular age path for education. Children have the opportunity to attend kindergarten from age three onward in Germany, in an integrated or segregated setting, on a part or full-time basis ( Schnell, R.,Paulig, P.,Tschamler, H., Freidhog, P.,& Nikol, H.,1984; Tschamler, personal communication, 1997). Once children reach the age of six years, they are eligible to attend "Grundschule" (elementary school), and placement will be determined according to the legislation of the state. An individualized education plan for each child will be determined for children who have been identified as having special needs, prior to their school entry (Eberwein,1996; Schaar, personal communication,1997).

Right to a written education plan. All four provinces' and states' educational policies include the right for a written education plan, as well as the necessity for the consultation and approval of the parent(s) and child.

Right to placement in the least restrictive environment. As mentioned above, the Alberta School Act (section 30), provides for children-at-risk to have an education appropriate to their needs. However, it is subject to interpretation as to what is appropriate, and whether it is the least restrictive alternative. Alternatively, the Quebec School Act (section 234) states that every board must adapt the educational services for students-at- risk, according to their needs. Hence while one province may mandate this element of inclusion, another province with permissive legislation, is specified that the appropriate board must take ownership for the children, Alberta's legislation doesn't, which leaves open the interpretation of the type of services offered. In Bavaria, some children do not have the right to be placed in the least restrictive environment. To the contrary, certain children-at-risk (e.g. those children with a mental handicap or behavior disorder) must attend a special segregated school (Schaar, personal communication, 1997). It has been determined in Brandenburg, and further in the city of Berlin (1996) that it is the educational responsibility of regular schools to include children with special needs, as it is the goal to have all children included in regular education programs. Parents are to have the choice between a regular or segregated setting for their child, although it is recognized that appropriate services to meet the needs of all children have not yet been implemented in some elementary schools, and many of the settings for higher education (Eberwein, 1996).

Right to ongoing review and assessment. The Alberta School Act (subsection 30[6]) states that a student shall have his/her program reviewed at least every three years after a decision is made until the student is no longer entitled to have an education program under the Act. This provision does not meet the standards as set out by the ten rights of every child, which states that a program must be reviewed at least annually. In Quebec it is mandated that individualized education programs must be reviewed at least annually (subsection 235), with the consultation and consent of the parents and the child if he/she is able to give such input (Educational Success for All: Special Education Policy Update, 1992). At present it is determined that individual programs of children-at-risk in Bavaria and Brandenburg will be reassessed on an as-needed basis (Eberwein, 1996; Schaar, personal communication, 1997). However this makes no guarantee that programs will be reviewed at least on a yearly basis, as suggested in the ten rights of education for all.

Right of students with special needs to have needs represented through guaranteed due process. The Alberta School Act (Subsection 103 [2]) states that where a decision may affect the education of a student; parents, or students themselves, where appropriate, have the right to request an appeal within a reasonable time from the date they were informed of the decision. The Quebec Education Act states that a student or parents of a student may request the Council of Commissioners to reconsider the decision (section 9) (Educational Success for All. Special Education Policy Update, 1992). In Bavaria, it is perceived parents will have input as to the decisions regarding programming for their child. In the event that they disagree with a decision regarding

the program or placement of their child, they do not have the right to appeal a decision (Schaar, personal communication, 1997). Parents in Brandenburg are considered to be "partners " in the education of their children, and thus parents actually have the final say as to the type of educational placement of their child. For example, if a "School Support Council" decided to favor a segregated educational setting for a child, the parents would still be able to choose a regular school placement (Eberwein, 1996).

Right of access to records and confidentiality. The Alberta School Act (section 18) requires a board to establish and maintain a school record for each student enrolled in its schools. As well, parents and students--where appropriate, are entitled to review test results, evaluations, and information. They are also entitled to receive an explanation of results. The regulation provides for confidentiality of records, but permits disclosure by a board in certain circumstances. This confidentiality agreement may potentially be breached through disclosure in certain circumstances that could be harmful to the student, and the student has no observable right to object. The Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms, 1982 (subsection 9), mandates that confidential information cannot be disclosed. However, parents and children legally have access to all records. In Bavaria, and Brandenburg parents of children-at-risk do have the right of access to all records and information regarding the education of their child(ren).

Legislation should be "child- centered". The Alberta School Act could be said to be permissive, and partially child-centered. Hence decisions may be made about students' placements or situations, without them knowing or participating.

Alternatively, Quebec's Education Act does mandate that children be included, or at least informed regarding all decisions affecting them (Anderson, 1986). In Bavaria, however it cannot it cannot be said that the legislation is child-centered. Children do not have the right participate in decision-making or have choices regarding their program/schooling (Schaar, personal communication, 1997). The Brandenburg School Act states that schooling must be "child-centered", and that the focus must be on the individual needs of a student (Eberwein, 1996).

Funding for special needs. Section 29 of the Alberta School Act states that there is special funding available for children who are determined to be in need for special services. However, the legislation does not guarantee the adequacy of this funding, nor there is a provision to ensure that the funding will be used for the purposes that it was allocated for.

Section (1) of the Quebec Education Act states that every person is entitled to educational services until 21 years of age if it is determined they are in need of these services (typical school leaving is 18), and every person is entitled to special services, within the scope of the services offered by each school board. As well, it is stated that these services are to be provided at public expense of the Quebec residents (Educational Success for All. Special Education Policy Update, 1992). In Bavaria and Brandenburg, there is additional funding allocated for students with identified needs (Eberwein, 1996; Empfehlungen zur Sonder-paedagogischen Foederung in den Schulen in der Bundesrepublik, Deutschland, 1994). It is provided on a pro-child basis, dependent

upon the severity of an individual's needs. However, as in Canada, there is no guarantee that this funding will be used for its intended purpose.

Comparison of the Trends in Educational Policies between the States and Provinces

Hence, from the perspective of Skrtic (1991), as documented above, it could be perceived that Bavaria, is demonstrating values through its educational system which are actually impeding the development of not only national, but international human rights values towards inclusion, which Germany as a nation had ratified towards. Herr Dr. Schaar, Minister of Education responsible for the portfolio regarding education "fuer Kinder die sind behindert", does not see it from that perspective (1997). He suggested that Bavaria is not against inclusion, that indeed, some students with physical handicapping conditions, visual and hearing impairments have been integrated into their neighborhood schools. However at this point in time, children with mental handicapping conditions, or learning or behavioral difficulties must attend special schools, if they attend public schools. It was also stated that it is unlikely that a change in this policy will take place in the next few years (Schaar, personal communication, 1997). Other researchers, (e.g., Leonhardt, personal communication, 1997; Tschamler, personal communication, 1997) have suggested that Bavaria has not yet accepted individuals with mental handicapping conditions, or behavioral challenges; that individuals with a physical or sensory handicapping condition are better accepted. It seems then, that in Bavaria a traditional paradigm of dual educational services is still being followed, whereby standardized assessment, labeling, categorization, and

segregated learning environments are taking place in some situations (Lipsky and Gartner, 1996).

Alternatively, Brandenburg, the state originally perceived to be more conservative, appears to be demonstrating an inclusive model of education, and educational equity, as defined by Skrtic (1991). Alberta and Quebec appear to be demonstrating legislation and educational trends which more closely resemble those of Brandenburg. However, as discussed previously, Quebec's legislation mandating provisions for children with special needs has resulted in increased clarity of provisioning of services over the Alberta Education Act (Anderson, 1986). Quebec's legislation has mandated an inclusive model of education which has been adopted and implemented. Although Alberta's philosophy is that of integration as a first alternative for placement of a child with special needs, other alternatives are still considered as possibilities (Horowitz, personal communication, 1997; Report on the Blue Ribbon Panel on Integration, 1997).

Utilizing a unified educational paradigm to meet the needs of all students as the goal for educational systems to reach, it appears as though the educational service delivery models of the four provinces/states of Alberta, Quebec, Bavaria, and Brandenburg display trends which are spiraling towards that goal, but may not yet have reached that destination. Quebec appears to be the furthest along, Brandenburg next, followed by Alberta, and then Bavaria.

\Towards Progressive Inclusion and Acceptance.

In 1994 the United Nations met at a world conference and basic ideologies for the education of all children were documented (Eberwein, 1996). The ideologies parallel the 10 Educational Rights of All Children (Making the most of the law: Education and the child with disabilities, 1993). It was stated that every child has the right to an education to be able to meet his/her potential. There must be a variety of school programs to meet the needs of all children, and all children will have the right to attend a regular school and receive appropriate supports (Eberwein, 1996). Further, it was stated that regular schools with an inclusive orientation are the best way to avoid discriminatory actions. Governments were then requested to put a high priority on the development of school systems that would be better able to accommodate all children (UNESCO, 1994).

Researchers (e.g., Stainbeck & Stainbeck, 1996; Skrtic, 1991), have frequently advocated for a unified system of education in which special education and regular education services would be merged into one 'unified' system to meet the needs of all students. Under this organizational structure, eligibility for special services would be based on the functional needs of a student, rather than a special or regular designation. Would this merger ensure that funding was available for those who needed it, or would the spiral rebound back to a 'one system for all' approach whereby funds to support special services (no longer existing ) were removed? Hence, Educational plans must be developed that match the needs of the student, This facilitates individualized programming to focus on the achievement of all individuals towards their potentials. This approach allows the individual abilities of students to be met, and for causes of

performance disorders to be treated (Lusthaus, & Lausthaus, 1996; Morrow, personal communication, 1996). In order for the spiral to move upwards towards progressive inclusion and acceptance, parent--school--community research must work towards increased collaborative planning, programming, and evaluation in order to be able to develop effective means of meeting the needs of all students in an inclusive manner.

Research has suggested (Davies, 1993; Davies, Palanki, & Burch, 1993), that children improve academically when schools work for better school and community development. Hence, components of successful collaboration seem to include the following elements:

1. Programs planned to comprehensively and intensively integrate educational services for all children, especially those at risk.

2. Parents, school personnel and community members who are empowered to make decisions about, plan for, and implement changes for children in the community.

3. School bureaucracy decreases, and involvement of the community and home in management increases.

4. University programs which provide training for successful partnerships.

5. Researchers, teachers, and parents working together in evaluating the successes, needs of school programming, and making the appropriate developmental changes (Davies, 1993, p.72).

## Summary

In keeping with the philosophies of the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada, and the Salamanca Documentation (UNESCO, 1994), all children must have

the right to an education so that they may achieve to their maximum potential. Canada and Germany represent two highly industrialized progressive countries, and yet it may be observed that there is much to be accomplished in order to ensure inclusion, according to the 10 Educational Rights of All Children.

The spiral is moving towards progressive inclusion and acceptance. Over the last several years, many changes have taken and are taking place, in philosophies, service delivery models, and program implementation. Let us hope that Canada and Germany will soon move towards the inclusion of all children. Perhaps in the 2000's, as Forest (1985) suggested, an educational system will have been achieved--which will service all children--in order that the spiral may travel towards ultimate acceptance and inclusion.

## References

Alberta Schools Act, Statutes of Alberta, 1988,c s-3.1 with amendments. (1998) Alberta: Department of Education.

Anderson, J. (1986) Effects of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms on provincial school legislation. .In M.E. Manley- Casimir & T. Sussel (Eds.). Courts in the classroom: Education and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms ( pp. 183-202). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited.

Barton, L. & Landman, M. (1993). The politics of integration: Observations on the Warnock report. In R. Slee, (Ed.) Is there a desk with my name on it?, The politics of integration. (pp. 41-49). London: The Falmer Press.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis. London: Heinemann.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982 (1986). In M.E. Manley-Casimir & T. Sussel (Eds.). Courts in the Classroom: Education and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (pp. 237-245). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited.

Canadian Education Association (1996). Early childhood education: New steps in integration: A Brief overview. Canadian Education Association Newsletter, October-November, 1996, 1-3.

Canadian School Executive (1985). Mainstreaming: Legal obligations for administrators. The Canadian School Executive Newsletter, February, 1985, 3-5.

Davies, D. (1993). Looking backward. In S. Thompson (Ed.). Whole child, Whole community ( pp. 67-72). Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Davies, D., Palanski, A.,& Burch, P. (1993). The Whole school for the whole child. In S. Thompson (Ed.). Whole child, whole community (pp. 18-23). Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Deutschen Bildungsrat. (1974). Emfehlungen der Bildungskommission- Zur paedagogischen Forderung behinderter und behinderung Betrohter Kinder und Jungendlicher 1973. Zeitschrift fuer Heilpaedagogik, beiheft, 11, 1-11.

Eberwein, H. (1996). Die Salamanca-Erklarung und der Aktionsrahmen zur Paedagogik fuer besondere Bedurfnisse.Indo dienst, Integrationspaedagogik,5, Sommersemester, 11-13.

Eberwein, H. (1996). Neufassung des 10A Berliner Schulgestzes. Info dienst, Integrationspaedagogik, 5 Sommersemester, 14.

Educational success for all. Special education policy update, (1992). Government of Quebec: Ministry of Education.

Emfehlungen zur Sonderpaedagogischen Forderung in den Schulen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland(1994). Sekretariat der standizen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Laender in der Bundesrepublick Deutschland- Beschluss der Kultisminister Konferenz vom 06.05.1994.

Forest, M.(1985). Education update. Canadian Journal on Mental Retardation, 35. Autumn, 1985.

Fyfe, D. (1996). Director, Student Services, Western Quebec School Board, personal communication, Autumn, 1996.

Goetze, H, PhD. Professor, (1996, 1997). Universitaet Potsdam, personal communication, September 5, 1996, January 13, 1997.

Horowitz, M.,PhD., (former Dean of Education and former University president) (1997). University of Alberta, Canada, personal communication, April 7, 1997.

Hunt, L. (1985). Building a vision, Public education for children with developmental handicaps. (2nd ed.) Kingston: Ministry of Employment and Immigration Canada.

In the Balance- Meeting Special Needs Within Public Education Task Force. (1997 ). Special Education Task Force Discussion. Alberta School Boards Association, Edmonton, Canada, April 18, 1997.

Legislation, the Collective Agreement and Services for Handicapped Pupils or Pupils with Learning or Emotional Problems in Quebec, (1992). Quebec: PAPT, Protestant Sector, Fall, 1992, 1-5.

Leonhart, A., PhD., Professor, (1997). Ludwig Maximillians Universitaet, Munich, personal communication, February 20, 1997.

Lipsky, D.,& Gartner, A. (1996). Inclusive Education and School Restructuring. In S. Stainbeck & W. Steinbeck (Eds.), Controversial Issues Confronting Special Education, Divergent Perspectives, (2nd ed). (pp. 3-15). Boston: Allyn and Brown.

Lister Bauer, S. (1997). Integration in Kanada. In Goetze. H. (Ed.), Schulische Erziehungschilfe- grenzuberschrietend. (pp. 100-104.) Potsdam: AVZ Hausdruckerei der Universitaet Potsdam.

MacKay, W. (1996). The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms: Implications for Students. In M.E. Stanley- Casimir & T. Sussel (Eds.). Courts in the Classroom: Education and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (pp. 9-50). Calgary: Detselif Enterprises Limited.

Making the Most of the Law: Education and the Child with Disabilities. (1993). Ontario: Learning Disabilities Association of Canada.

Muth, J. (1996). Zur bildungspolititischen dimension der integration. In H. Eberwein (Ed.) Behinderte und nicht behinderte lernen gemeinsam- Handbuch der Integrationspaedagogik. (pp.17-24). Weinheim: Basal.

Myscher, N. (1996). Sonderpaedagogik- Integration-Integrationspaedagogik. Facten und Statements fuer eine Actuelle Diskussion. Info dienst Integrationspaedagogik 5, Sommersemester, 3-11.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1996). Successful Services for our Children and Families at Risk. Paris: OECD.

Report on the Blue Ribbon Panel on Integration (1997). Edmonton, Canada: Alberta Teacher's Association.

Schnell, R., Paulig, P., Tschamler, H., Freidhogg, P., & Nikol, H. (1984). Integration. Ingolstadt, Germany: Courir Druck Laus Ingolstadt.

Schaar, A., PhD.,(1997).Minister of Education for Services for Children with Special Needs, Bavaria, personal communication, January 23, 1997.

Skrtic, T. (1991). Behind Special Education, a Critical Analysis of Professional Culture and School Organization. Colorado: Love Publishing Company.

Smith, W. (1994). Equal educational opportunity for students with disabilities: Legislative action in Canada. Montreal: McGill University, Office of Research on Educational Policy.

Stainbeck, S. & Stainbeck, W. (1986). One system, one purpose: The integration of special and regular education. Entourage, 1 ,(3). 12-16.

Stainbeck, S., Stainbeck W.,& Ayres, B. (1996). Schools as Inclusive communities. In S. Stainbeck & W. Stainbeck. (Eds.) Controversial Issues confronting special education, divergent perspectives. (2nd ed.) (pp. 31-43). Boston: Allyn & Brown.

Tschamler, H. PhD., Professor, (1997). Ludwig Maximillians Universitaet, Munich, personal communication, January 7, 11, 21, 27 & 28, 1997.

UNESCO, (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework on Special Needs Education. Paris: UNESCO.

Wolfensberger, W. (1975). The origin and nature of our institutional models. Syracuse: New York: Human Policy Press.

## Appendix 1

### Ten Educational Rights of All Children

In 1992 the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada formulated a list of ten educational rights, for all children (Making the Most of the Law: Education and the Child with Disabilities, 1993). It is against these rights that the policies regarding the education of children with special needs in Canada and Germany were evaluated.

#### Right to attend school

This means that every child has the right to be physically present at school, and it is the responsibility of the school authorities to accommodate the child. This right does not define the type or quality of education.

#### Right of each student to an individualized education program based on identified need

This right exemplifies that students should have an individualized education program based on their identified needs so that they can have an equal opportunity to achieve to their potential.

#### Right to early intervention and education intervention: Appropriate testing and evaluation

This right implies that a student's exceptional learning needs should be addressed during his/her earliest years; the emphasis is on prevention.

#### Right to a written individual education plan

There should be a written individual education plan (IEP) which identifies the needs of a student -at-risk, and how these needs will be met. This plan should be

developed with the consultation and approval of the child if appropriate, (dependent on the age and capacity) and the child's parent or guardian.

Right to placement in the least restrictive environment

This right means that a child is placed in an educational environment that is identified as being most suitable for the child's physical, social and educational needs, the first choice being a child's age-appropriate classroom in the neighborhood school.

Right to ongoing review and assessment

There should be a regular formative and summative assessment of each child's program and progress, at least on an annual basis.

Right of students to have their interests represented through guaranteed due process

This is the right of the parent and/or child (as appropriate) to an appeal, or review by an impartial tribunal regarding the decision that has been made regarding the educational program of a child-at risk.

Right of access to records and confidentiality.

This right suggests that it should be mandatory that decisions and records kept about students-at-risk be kept confidential. In addition, the parent, and the child, after a certain age should have access to these records.

The legislation should be 'child-centered'

The term 'child-centered' in this situation, refers to the expectation that children's interests should be the focus of the decision making. As well they must be

informed and consulted about all decisions affecting them, depending upon their ability to understand the nature of the decisions and engage in appropriate consultation.

Funding for special needs of students

This right states that adequate financial resources should be allocated for educational support for students-at-risk. This funding may be utilized for additional equipment, teaching or therapeutic support, transportation, and so on, depending on the individual needs of the student. Additionally there needs to be procedures allocated for ensuring that the money is spent appropriately, as designated.

(In the balance- Meeting special needs within public education: Task Force, 1997; Lister-Bauer, 1997; & Making the most of the law: Education and the child with disabilities,1993).

RUNNING HEAD: Effectiveness of Success for All

# CHAPTER III

# EFFECTIVENESS OF THE 'SUCCESS FOR ALL' PROGRAM MODEL

A version of this chapter has been published. [ (1998). The Effectiveness of the 'Success for All' Program Model. Exceptionality Education Canada, 7, (1 & 2 ), 69-86.]

## Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to reflect upon the current state of research on the achievement outcomes of the 'Success for All' program intervention. The Success for All program intervention was designed as an early elementary preventive and intensive intervention program for children-at-risk of failing to learn to read. This paper discussed the efficacy of the 'Success for All' model from a causal perspective. Suggestions are made that it is a highly effective program model, however the effectiveness of each of the intervention components has yet to be ascertained.

The Success for All program was designed as an early elementary preventive and intensive intervention for children-at-risk of failing to learn to read, which began as a pilot program in one school in 1987. The program has now been replicated in over 300 schools across the United States, and 2 sites thus far in Canada. Success for All, a program developed at the John Hopkins University at the Centre for Research on Disadvantaged Students, was designed to ensure that all students in a high poverty school setting would achieve reading skills to grade level. Success as the outcome measure was defined as "performing in reading at or near grade level by the third grade, and maintaining this status through the end of the elementary grades and avoiding retention or special education" (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, and Wasik, 1993, p. 125).

What makes the Success for All program effective? Which elements of the intervention facilitate the greatest success? Answers to these questions, and whether we can determine a causal relationship between the intervention variables and the outcome/dependent variable reflect the actual effectiveness of the intervention program.

Overview of the Success For All Program Model

Dunst, Snyder, and Mankinen (1989) suggested that many efficacy studies have been evaluated from the perspective of "does early intervention work" without sufficient evaluation of the causal relationship between the independent and dependent variables. They explained that researchers have frequently not considered the effects of other variables which may interact with the independent variable(s) and cause resulting changes in the outcome(s)--dependent variable.

Dunst et al. (1989) stated that too often the effects of the family and 'ecosystems' have not been considered in early intervention research, the effects that will affect the intervention, and consequently the outcome. How clearly have specific paradigms of the Success for All program been evaluated to determine the efficacy? In order to determine the causal relationship between the independent intervention and dependent variables, a conceptual framework of early intervention as developed by Dunst et al. was utilized to determine the efficacy of the Success for All program intervention.

## Early Intervention

Early intervention typically refers to the level of program involvement through an educational or therapeutic treatment. Denhoff (1981) described early intervention as referring to enrichment models which were designed to provide developmentally appropriate services to babies and toddlers at-risk. Traditionally early intervention referred to models of intervention for children up to 5 years of age (Geralnick, 1988); however more recently early intensive school-based enrichment programs are being included within this classification.

Dunst et al. (1989) suggested that early intervention includes "...The aggregation of many types of help, assistance, services, and so forth provided to families by individuals and groups (p.260). They discussed two types of intervention; formal and informal. Formal intervention was described as being provided by a planned treatment program. Informal intervention refers to assistance provided by friends, relatives, and so on. It may also be referred to as social support.

Factors other than formal intervention and social support may affect the behavior and development of children (outcome variables) so these other factors need to be addressed in a evaluation of a model of intervention. Early intervention within a school- based model for students-at-risk has taken a number of forms. These may include; provision of enriched preschool programs, full day kindergarten, and one-to-one tutoring of children-at-risk in grade one (Clay, 1979; Pinnell, 1991). The effects of intervention from formal and informal perspectives will affect the outcome of intervention, so all elements of intervention must be addressed and accounted for to determine the efficacy of a model of intervention.

Efficacy of Early Intervention Programs

For the purposes of this paper, efficacy refers to "... The extent to which provision of early intervention and support provide positive influences on the intervention in such a manner that competing explanations can be ruled out (Dunst et al., 1989, p. 260). Dunst et al. Referred to 3 elements of efficacy, which included dependence, specificity, and non-spuriousness. Dependence referred to the degree of the relationship between the independent and dependent variable. Specificity referred to the degree to which specific elements of the intervention could be related to changes in the outcome or dependent variable. The degree of spuriousness of a model of intervention may be determined by the extent that conflicting variables have been accounted for, and extent that the intervention is the primary effect on the dependent variable. The goal of this paper was to determine the degree to which the elements of intervention in the Success for All program intervention may be determined as

demonstrating an observable relationship with the dependent variable, thus demonstrating a significant degree of efficacy. This goal , then, facilitated determination of the degree of causal inference on the effects of the independent (intervention) variable on the dependent (outcome) variable.

The efficacy of the early intervention programs is typically measured utilizing children's progress as the primary outcome (Dunst et al., 1989; Epps & Tindel, 1987). Many theorists have suggested the use of 'broader-based', more ecologically relevant measures. For school-based programs, ecologically relevant outcomes may include; retention in grade, special education placement versus a regular classroom placement, children's attitudes, values and aspirations; teacher and community acceptance, and so on (Dunst et al.; Heikinaro-Johansson, 1995).

## Success for All--A School-Based Early Intervention Program

Success for All represents a coordinated multi-year program of prevention and intervention (Madden et al., 1993; Ross, Smith, Casey, Johnson & Bond, 1994; Slavin & Madden, 1995). The intervention was designed to ensure that all students may succeed in learning basic skills in early grades. Although the intervention model includes elements of formal and social intervention, the dependent variable is based upon the children's reading progress; namely reading level reached by third grade, avoidance of retention in a grade, and degree of absenteeism (Madden et al., 1993).

The Success for All program was designed to support young children-at-risk in elementary school. Slavin and Madden (1989) defined a student-at-risk as "one who is in danger of failing to complete his or her education with an adequate level of skills" (p.

4). Risk factors may include; low achievement, retention in grade, behavior problems, poor attendance, low socio-economic status, or attendance at schools with large numbers of poor students. Conditional relationships with these variables and outcomes may be examined to determine their effect(s) on the dependent variable. The Success for All intervention program has been replicated across many school districts, in over 300 schools (Slavin and Madden, 1995) in the United States with children from high poverty and 'inner city' schools.

However, the extent to which there has been a separation of groups of children with varying characteristics has been on a per-school basis. Schools considered to be more disadvantaged have been provided with increased numbers/amounts of personnel and materials, particularly in the numbers of tutors and family support staff. The Success for All program was developed on the basis of several assumptions regarding effective intervention for children-at-risk (Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Livermon & Dolan 1990). These assumptions include the following; (a) early intervention to prevent learning problems will be more effective than remediating already established deficiencies, (b) reading and language arts are the most critical curriculum areas for providing enriched interventions as the skills taught in these areas provide the foundation for learning in all other subjects, and (c) interventions need to be comprehensive to include factors outside of the classroom that affect children's readiness and motivation to learn. These factors are cited (Slavin et al., 1990) to include parental involvement, school attendance, and health needs.

The Success for All program was then designed to include the following components in order to adequately meet the assumptions listed above: (a) enriched

preschool and full day kindergarten programs; (b) one-to-one tutoring in reading by certified teachers; (c) regrouping of students in grades one-to-three into homogeneous cross-grade ability groups during the Language Arts time with 10-15 students per group; (d) frequent (8 week) criterion-based assessments to determine reading progress/program changes; (e) a systematic reading program which integrated story telling and retelling (STAR), phonics in beginning reading, vocabulary building, comprehension skills and cooperative learning; (f) a family support team to provide parenting education and assistance for students experiencing personal or health difficulties; and (g) a program facilitator to work in the school to coordinate and oversee the program (Slavin et al., 1990).

It is interesting to note that although the enriched preschool and full day kindergarten are key components of the program model, in several studies the researchers do not refer to these elements of the program intervention. The regrouping of the reading groups, one-to-one tutoring, family support team, and program facilitator are the four elements of the model on which the studies are focussed (Ross, et al., 1994); Slavin et al., 1990; Slavin et al., 1995).

Validity Threats to the Success for All Program Intervention

Dunst et al. (1989) suggested that as the benefits of early intervention are controversial, it is extremely important to develop a conceptual framework to be able to effectively evaluate the efficacy of early intervention studies. A simplistic paradigm to discern the effects of early intervention could be presented as $< B = f(A)>$, whereby B would represent the outcome or dependent variable, and f would vary as a function of

the relationship between A and B (Dunst et al.). However, in order to take into account the diversity of variables which affect <B>--the dependent variable-- the equation needs to be expanded. An expanded equation, which would take into account a wider range of variables affecting this situation could read: <B = f (I, S, F, CO, X)> (see Table 3.1). Here (I) would represent early intervention characteristics category, (F) would stand for the family characteristics category, (C) would be the child characteristics category, (O) would be other explanatory variables category (policy decisions, etc.), and (X) would be the set of competing characteristics which may pose threats to internal validity (history, maturation, etc.) (Dunst et al., 1989). If one were to place the Success for All program in this equation, one could observe the range of variables that may possibly affect (B) the outcome, or children's reading progress.

To this date, there has been no effort to evaluate the program components of Success for All separately, or to evaluate it in different settings (Madden et al, 1993). As well, Ross et al (1994) stated that there have been inconsistent results from site to site, and study to study with the Success for All program intervention. These authors reported that programs differ from site-to-site in teacher training, school conditions, and as well, the appropriateness of the "control" programs used for evaluation comparisons. Slavin et al. ( 1993) reported that inconsistencies may be due to the results of matches with control schools that are changing, possibly improving their curricula to more closely reflect effective practices as approved by research, so resultantly have become increasingly similar to "program intervention" schools.

Ross et al. (1994) additionally described "other types of additionally occurring dynamics." that took place from school to school, "... probably had effects that were not

measured" (p. 24). Factors described included: (a) competition between staff and principals of matched schools as well as between schools that were starting up new programs at the same time, (b) principal and major staff transfers, (c) quality and extent of training of teachers, (d) level of commitment and loyalty to the program by the teachers, principals and facilitators, and (e) rural vs. urban environments, and (f) background characteristics of students (Ross et al, 1994). When discussing internal validity, the ability to conclude that the intervention (I) had the main effects upon B is limited. There has been no attempt made to determine the effects of these conditional relationships on the dependent outcome variable. As a result, the Success for All programs demonstrate a high specificity weakness, and a high degree of spuriousness.

Components of Internal Validity

Internal threats, as documented by Cook and Campbell (1979), which could affect this model of early intervention include history, maturation, testing, and instrumentation. History, referring to events that are taking place at the same time as a treatment is being provided, is a possible threat to internal validity. The use of a matched group design was utilized to attempt to control for history. Maturation is a definite possible threat to internal validity. The intervention time frame generally took place from preschool age to grade three. During this time many physiological, physical and psychological changes took place within the subjects.

Testing is a possible threat to internal validity as all subjects were pre- and post-tested on reading abilities. However, the interval between is long, minimizing the possibility of this threat. Regular informal criterion referenced assessment in the

reading program could have resulted in testing effects. Instrumentation is a definite threat to the internal validity of the program model. This possibility is documented by Ross et al. (1994) and Madden et al. (1993). Instrumentation, referring to inconsistent or unreliable measurement procedures which resulted from discrepancies in teacher training and lack of consistency is an area to be addressed in further replications of the program. Selection is less likely to be a threat to internal validity as the researchers have utilized a matched groups design whereby Success for All schools were matched with comparison schools that were similar in S E S, historical achievement level, and so on. Researchers attempted to control for statistical validity by utilizing specially trained college students unaware of program hypotheses for student testing.

Statistical Significance of Reading Scores Obtained for Success for All

Specific testing measures utilized included: Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery (Woodcock, 1997), Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Durrell, & Catterson, 1980), retentions in grade level (these measures were only kept for the Success for All intervention settings), and attendance records on a yearly basis (only available from Success for All settings). Within each matched school, students were individually correlated according to standardized achievement test scores from the previous spring. The control schools implemented a traditional reading program, and children-at-risk received traditional group pull-out remedial programming.

The reading test data were analyzed using multivariate analyses of variance (MANCOVAs) with pretests (standard scores) as covariates and raw scores on the three reading scales as dependent measures. Following the multivariate analyses, univariate

Table 3.1

Validity Threats to the Success for All Program Intervention.

$$B = f(A), \text{ if}$$

$$A = (I, S, F, C, O, X), \text{ then}$$

$$B = f(I, S, F, C, O, X)$$

Whereby let B represent the outcome or dependent variable. Let f vary as a function of the relationship between B and A. Let A represent the number of variables that may affect B.

B is the outcome or dependent variable—Children's progress in reading.
f varies as a function of the relationship between B and A.
A represents the number of variables that may affect B.

These include:

I - early intervention characteristics-
- age of entry, intensity of involvement, type of special needs of each child

S – family supports
- family support team, teachers, other staff, volunteers

F – family characteristics
- low SES, varied parental ages, family status, education, experience

C – child characteristics
- children-at-risk academically, ESL, low SES, family circumstances

O – other explanations
- program facilitator, principal, school board, funding

X – competing characteristics
- history, maturation, testing, instrumentation, attrition

analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were computed for each dependent measure (Madden et al., 1993; Ross et al., 1994). These researchers presented the results of the Success for All 1990-91 school year in the five Baltimore sites. The results of this study were significant as it was the first year that the children could be evaluated at the end of the third grade. As the original goal of the Success for All program intervention was to bring all children near grade level in reading performance by the end of the third grade, (Slavin et al., 1990) it represented an important year for the outcome of the program.

As discussed earlier, specific reading measures utilized included the Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery (Woodcock, 1987) and Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Durrell & Catterson, 1980). Assessments of reading proficiency were individually administered to students. Two Woodcock scales, Letter-Word identification and Word Attack, were administered to students in grades one through three. The Durrell Oral Reading Scale was administered to students in grades one through three as well (Madden et al., 1993, p. 132).

The 1990-91 first grade grouping is the first group to have experienced Success for All from preschool, kindergarten and grade one programs in 4 out of the 5 schools. Multivariate analyses were statistically significant at all schools, and univariate analyses showed significant effects ($p<.05$) on the Woodcock Word Attack scale in all schools and positive, although consistantly less effects on the other reading measures. Effect sizes averaged +.38 for Letter Word, +.91 for Word Attack and +.23 for the Oral Reading scale (Madden et al, 1993, p. 132). Results at the second grade level demonstrate a broadening of the program effects to all reading measures. The

Multivariate analyses were significant at 4 out of the 5 schools, where the analysis failed to achieve the significant level of $p<.13$. Statistically significant differences ($p<.05$ or better) were demonstrated for all measures at 4 out of the 5 schools. Average effect sizes were +.55 for Letter Word, +.70 for Word Attack and +.55 for Oral Reading. For the lowest achieving second graders effects were also very positive. Overall effect sizes were +.68 for Letter Word, +1.50 for Word Attack, and +.82 for Oral Reading (Madden et al., 1993).

The effects for the third graders were similar to those for second graders. The multivariate analyses were significant for all 5 schools and univariate analyses were statistically significant ($p<.05$ or better) on 4 out of 5 schools. Average effect sizes were +.50 for Letter Word, +.71 for Word Attack and +.50 for Oral Reading. Again, effects for the lowest achieving students were larger than for students in general, but not always statistically significant. Average effect sizes were +.84 for Letter Word, +1.05 for Word Attack and +1.04 for Oral Reading (Madden et al., 1993).

Not all students demonstrated positive scores however, after receiving the Success for All reading intervention. On the Durrell scale, 15.7 percent of Success for All students were still performing at least one year below grade level, and 3.9 percent were two years behind (Madden et al.,1993). This was still better than the results obtained in the control schools. In these schools, 38 percent of third graders were performing at least one year below grade level, and 11.7 percent two years below (Madden et al., p. 142).

Following the fourth year of the implementation of the Success for All program in Baltimore, outcomes were very positive on a variety of measures in grades one

through three. Multivariate analyses found positive significant results in all schools, across grade levels, except in one grade in two settings. Across reading measures, effect sizes averaged +.51 in first grade, +.60 in second grade, and +.57 in third grade. Other studies though have demonstrated varied results. Slavin and Madden (1995) demonstrated very positive outcomes for the Success for All intervention when it was replicated with English Language learners. In this study, all categories of Success for All students scored significantly better than control students. When Success for All was replicated in four cities and states beyond Baltimore, (Ross et al., 1994), again a comparison of individual reading test results with those of matched control groups demonstrated advantages at three of the four sites. This took place particularly with the lowest achieving 25 percent of students, relative to their control counterparts at all four sites.

Although there was variability within the Success for All program results between settings, the program model generally displayed an advantage in reading progress over matched control groups (Ross et al.). Variations in results from different Success for All program sites have been hypothesized as being due to differences in teacher training, school conditions, and validity threats (Ross et al.). The research does not demonstrate specificity of dimensions affecting (S), and conditional relationships between the dimensions of the intervention and other explanatory variables have not been explored.

Affective Appraisals About the Success for All Program Intervention

Social validity (Wolf, 1978) refers to the judgment based assessments that include

affective appraisals made about children which influence teaching, treatment, and child progress. Various assessments are available to measure traits and behaviors that may not be captured by the more objective instruments. The Success for All program did not attempt to measure or control social validity. Yet, it is documented to be a key area of concern (Slavin et al.,1996), as each program site had a family support team to work with children and families to provide informal intervention and support as needed.

External Validity

The Success for All program has been replicated frequently with populations of children-at-risk in high poverty or inner city school settings. Most recently the program model was utilized with children for whom English was a second language. The researchers advocated as well for further replication of the study with English language learners. Hence, the program intervention appears to demonstrate high external validity, in that it can be generalized effectively to children with varied learning needs. It would enhance the external validity significantly if the program intervention could be replicated as well with other groups of children with special needs by independent researchers in varied settings.

## Framework of Causal Inferences of Intervention Measures

Dunst et al. (1989) developed a classification scale which may be utilized to determine the degree of causal inference of the treatment in early intervention studies. Within this framework, studies are rated according to various components, including: (a) degree of specificity of early intervention-related variables, (b) assessment of the influence of formal and informal social support, (c) degree to which efficacy of the

early intervention is assessed in relation to varying family and child characteristics, (d) degree to which threats to internal validity are assessed and controlled, (e) degree to which broad-based and ecological measures are used as dependent measures, and (f) degree to which there is a functional relationship between the independent and dependent variables. A rating according to a 5 point scale is given for each of the categories. The ratings are all added together, to give an overall score from which an overall degree of causal inference may be determined. The efficacy of the Success for All model is discussed in the following section, according to the degree of causal inference determined by the 5 point rating scale as described above.

Components of the Causal Inference Framework Regarding Success for All

The goal of the researchers was to demonstrate that due to the nature of the intervention, students involved in Success for All made more progress than control group subjects. Thus, schools and students were matched prior to the start of the study on the basis of economic and academic factors. Matching was utilized in order that selection would not be a threat to internal validity.

Specificity

Within the Success for All program model, the efficacy of the program was assessed dichotomously, and no attempt was made to relate specific program dimensions to program success. There was no separation of the effects of differential age of entry to the program, degree of parental involvement, or family support program, enriched preschool, full day kindergarten, or individual tutoring, and so on. Thus on a

scale of 1 to 5, the study received the lowest score of 1 due to lack of specificity to relate specific program elements to program success.

Social Support

The extent to which supports were specifically assessed regarding their impact on the dependent measures was low. The researchers recognized the need for family support, and within the intervention framework there is a component of family support services. The control groups do not have formal family support services as a component of their intervention. Yet, the specific effects of the formal or informal social supports was not taken into account. This study then received a score of 3 out of a possible 5 as the potential influences of social support were recognized, but not evaluated.

Child and Family Characteristics

Very limited information was provided about the children, or family characteristics in the studies discussed. The children were all from high poverty-inner city areas, but beyond that very little information was provided. Family support teams formed an integral part of the intervention model. It may be inferred that the family situation was an important element to the successful outcome of the intervention, although there was no qualitative or quantitative measure to validate that inference. Thus, a qualitative assessment of this category would be 2 out of 5. Obviously, child and family characteristics are important, and are addressed within the program intervention; however there is little information provided, and there is no evaluation of any conditional relationships.

Internal Validity

The Success for All program model utilized a matched groups design whereby treatment schools were matched with control schools, and children in treatment schools were matched with children in control settings. Subjects and schools were matched, based on previous academic scores and socio-economic similarities. This process may help control for the threat of selection whereby differences between groups is due to individual differences, not intervention differences. Multi-factor analyses of variance (MANOAs) were utilized to analyze the reading data. As well , univariate analyses of co-variance (ANCOVA) were computed for each of the outcome reading measures. Other threats including: history, maturation, testing, and instrumentation were potential threats to this study, although attempts were made to control these competing explanations through the matched group design. With regards to the above factors, the Success for All program received a value of 3 out of 5 in the area of internal validity.

Dependent Measures

As discussed previously, early intervention efficacy has typically been evaluated according to the progress of the children involved. Dunst et al. (1989) and others have noted the importance of the utilization of 'broader-based' measures of program effectiveness and more ecologically relevant outcomes. Additionally, Dunst et al. suggested that school based interventions need to review relevant factors which may include: retention in grade; special educational settings vs. regular inclusive settings; children's attitudes, values, and goals; community acceptance; and so on. (p. 261).

The Success for All's primary method of evaluation was the children's progress in reading. Retention in grade and school attendance were also measured for the Success for All intervention sites, although not for the control sites. Thus, no comparisons could be made between the two settings. As well, no direct measures of the effects of enriched preschool, full day kindergarten, or family support services were made. Assumptions were made based on other researchers' data or previous studies which they had conducted in different settings and contexts that these were important elements to include in a comprehensive early intervention program model, and they were included without assessing them in the context of this program intervention. Consequently, in the program design evaluation, this intervention would receive a 3 out of 5 in the category of dependent measurement.

Functional Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables

One conclusion that may be made from this intervention analysis, was that there was a functional relationship between the independent and dependent measures. It was generally found that the amount of progress made by the experimental groups was greater than that by the control groups. However, the effects of some elements of the intervention model were not isolated in outcome measures, so it is not known which elements of the intervention model are the most relevant--or least relevant--to the dependent variable. This model of intervention would receive a 2 out of 5 in this category. The Success for All program thus received a total score of 14 out of a possible total of 30 points. This score placed this study in the group that Dunst et al.(1989)

Table 3. 2

Efficacy of the Success for All Program Model

| Elements of causal inference | Rating out of 5 | Justification of rating |
|---|---|---|
| Specificity | 1 | No separation of effects of program dimensions to program outcome |
| Social Support | 3 | Specific effects of formal/informal social supports is not taken into account |
| Family and Child Characteristics | 2 | Very limited information available about children or family characteristics |
| Internal Validity | 3 | Matched group design attempted to control for competing explanations |
| Dependent Measures | 3 | Outcome measure is children's progress in reading. |
| Dependence | 2 | Outcome measure is children's progress in reading. |

Rating Scale = 1 2 3 4 5

No attempt/ attention paid ⟶ Highly specific

Total score = 14 out of 30 points

= low to moderate causal inference classification level.

would term as being in the low to moderate causal inference classification level. Figure 3.2 illustrates the efficacy of the Success for All program. This rating was formulated from the evaluation of four studies (Madden et al., 1993; Ross et al., 1994; Slavin et al., 1994; Slavin et al., 1995). Specific elements of the program model require further assessment to determine their efficacy and value. Further research on the Success for All program intervention is needed in order to obtain valid efficacy results about each components of the program intervention.

## Summary

The Success for All model of instruction seeks to prevent problems in elementary school by addressing reading difficulties with early intensive intervention. The intervention, which began with English speaking students academically-at-risk, provides enriched academic support from preschool to kindergarten onward, particularly through the one-to-one tutoring provided to students-at-risk in grade one. The program model was more recently adapted to provide literacy instruction in English as a second language, in settings where children begin school speaking another language. Although the program model has demonstrated a lack of specificity, and there has been observable variability in implementation quality and achievement outcomes; in general, the model has demonstrated superior individual reading test results over those of matched control groups. This finding has been demonstrated even more clearly with the lowest achieving 25 percent of students, relative to their control counterparts (Madden et al., 1993). Thus, through the aggregation of the intervention components,

the Success for All program intervention has demonstrated a high degree of effectiveness with the populations with whom it has been utilized.

To summarize, Success for All was initially designed as an early elementary preventative and intensive intervention model for children at risk learning to read. The effectiveness of this model has been evaluated against a causal analysis framework, as was developed by Dunst et al. (1989). Results of this analysis placed the Success for All model in the low to moderate causal classification level. However, the Success for All program intervention has demonstrated a high success rate at a program level. With continued and differentiated program and efficacy research, it is likely we will continue to see further expansion of the Success for All program. It is hoped so, as it has been demonstrated to be a successful holistic intervention to enhance the reading performance for children-at-risk in inclusive settings, and thus has valuable implications for future policy and practice.

## References

Allington, R. (1983). The reading instruction provided readers of differing reading abilities. Elementary School Journal, 83, 548-559.

Anderson, J.(1982). Acquisition of cognitive skill. Psychological Review, 89, 369-406.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1996). Introduction to research in education (5th ed.), Philadelphia: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Brown, A.C. (1977). Development, schooling, and the acquisition of knowledge about knowledge in R.C. Anderson, R.H. Spiro, and W.E. Montague (Eds.), School and the acquisition of knowledge. Hillsdale. N.J.:Erlbaum

Clay, M. (1979). The early detection of reading difficulties. (3rd ed.), New Zealand: Heinemann Education.

Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (1979). Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

Denhoff, E. (1981). Current status of infant stimulation or enrichment programs for children with developmental disabilities. Pediatrics, 67(1), 32-37. (Dunst, C., Snyder, S., and Mankinen, M. (1989). Efficacy of Early Intervention.

Dunst, C., Snyder, S., & Mankinen, M. (1989). Efficacy of early intervention. In M. Wang, M. Reynolds, and H. Walberg (Eds.), Handbook of special education. Low incidence conditions. Vol.3. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Durrell, D. & Catterson, J. (1980). Durrell analysis of reading difficulty. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Epps, S., & Tindal, G. (1987). Effectiveness of differential programming in serving students with mild handicaps: placement options and instructional programming. In Wang, M., Reynolds, M., & Walberg, H. (Eds.), Handbook of special education: Learner characteristics and adaptive education (vol.1), (pp.213-248). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Heikinaro-Johansson, P. (1995). Including students with special needs in physical education. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Jsvaskyla, Finland.

Jacobson, S., & Sawatsky, D. (1993). Meeting the challenge of integrating students with special needs: understanding, building, and implementing integration as inclusion. Canadian Journal of Special Education, 9(1), 60-66.

Madden, N., Slavin, R., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. (1993). Success for all: longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner city elementary schools. American Educational Research Journal, 30, (1), 123-148.

Neisworth, J., & Bagnato, S. (1988). Assessment in early childhood special education. In S. Odom and M. Karnes (Eds.), Early Intervention for infants and children with handicaps, (pp.23-49). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Odom, S.L. (1988). Research in early childhood special education. In S. Odom and M. Karnes (Eds.), Early intervention for infants and children with handicaps, (pp.1-21). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Pinnell, G. (1991). Réstructuring beginning reading with the reading recovery approach. Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Ross, S., Smith, L., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994). Using "Success for All" to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, L.A.; New Orleans.

Ross, S., Smith, L., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994). Increasing the academic success of disadvantaged children: an examination of alternative early intervention programs. American Educational Research Journal, 32 (4), 773-800.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B. Mortimore, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: secondary schools and their effects on children. London: Open Books.

Skrtic, T. (1991). Behind special education, a critical analysis of professional culture and school organization. Colorado: Love Publishing Co.

Slavin, R., Dolan, N., Madden, N., Karweit, N., & Wasik, B. (1992). Success for All: policy implications. Report No. 35, Baltimore, M.D.: Centre for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R., Dolan, L., & Madden, N. (1994). Scaling up: lessons learned in the dissemination of Success for All. Report No.46, Baltimore, MD: Centre for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R., & Madden, N. (1989). What works for students ar risk: a research synthesis. Educational Leadership, (2), 4-13.

Slavin, R., & Madden, N. (1995). Effects of Success for All on the achievement of English language learners. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Spregel, D. (1995). A comparison of traditional remedial programs and Reading Recovery: Guidelines for successful programs. Reading Teacher, 49(2), 86-95.

Weisz, J.R. (1980). Perceived control and learned-helplessness among mentally retarded and non-mentally retarded children: A Developmental analysis. Developmental Psychology, 15, 311-319.

Woodcock, R. (1997). Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery. Circle Pines: MN. American Guidance Service.

RUNNING HEAD: Program Interventions Compared

# CHAPTER IV

# PROGRAM INTERVENTIONS TO SUPPORT INCLUSIVE PRACTICES: READING RECOVERY AND SUCCESS FOR ALL COMPARED

## Abstract

This paper reviews the elements of two program interventions; Reading Recovery (Clay, 1985), and Success for All (Slavin, Dolan, & Madden, 1994) which were developed to support children-at-risk in inclusive school settings. The focus of each program intervention is initially reviewed, followed by a comparison of the nature of the similarities and differences within and between the programs. Comparisons are made according to the following elements: (a) their development and growth in Canada, (b) provision of teacher training and support, (c) theoretical focus, (d) methods of assessment utilized and the nature of the program intervention, (e) focus of the tutoring component, (f) expectations for parental involvement and support, and (g) efficacy and longitudinal benefits. Both Reading Recovery and Success for All are renowned internationally, have similar theoretical orientations, yet offer preventive support for children-at-risk from divergent frameworks of intervention. The goal of this review is to offer an understanding of the focus of each of these program interventions, which were designed to support teachers in meeting the needs of children-at-risk in inclusive classrooms today.

"Kids that learn to read succeed in school; kids that succeed in school succeed in life (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996, p.11). Hence, one of the greatest challenges facing educators today is to provide programs of instruction that will encourage all children to flourish. As society's values and educational policies have evolved towards not only the encouragement, but the expectation of multicultural and inclusive education for all, important implications face educators who must meet with this challenge successfully.

The placement of students with special needs in regular school programs evolved from a philosophy of equality, sharing, and the worthiness of all individuals. In some cases though, integration attempts have failed due to insufficient planning and resources. Sensitivity to these situations has increased teachers' awareness of the inequities that can undermine their efforts to provide a quality education for all children when there is not adequate access to in-service training, consultative, or financial support.

Many teachers have sought ways to implement a program for all children but have discovered that there is 'no magic answer' or 'quick fix'. The diversity of children's ability levels in regular settings continues to increase, as children with a variety of learning needs, cultural backgrounds and family circumstances are included. The ability to effectively facilitate learning opportunities for all children and provide an atmosphere to support diversity, may seem to some teachers like an unachievable goal. Hence, there exists an urgent need to develop and implement programs of support that will empower teachers by providing them with effective knowledge, skills, support, and materials to be able to accept this challenge.

## Reading as a Key to Success in School

Reading has been defined as a key for success in school, as researchers have suggested that people use reading as a means of accomplishing other tasks (Juel, 1988; Lloyd, Kaufman, Landrum, & Roe, 1991). Children who can read well are also at an advantage not only when literature is studied, but as well in social studies, science, and even mathematics. As an adult, literacy is almost a necessity to be able to function independently in western society. The majority of jobs require basic reading skills, and many daily living tasks and adult privileges such as writing a cheque, deciphering "how-to" instructions, or getting a driver's permit, require at least basic literacy skills.

### Early Difficulties May Lead to Long Term Weaknesses

Early literacy weaknesses seem to magnify, and negatively affect children's learning as they move through school. Children who are behind in kindergarten and first grade are likely to fall further behind in the second and third grade (Juel, 1988; Slavin & Madden, 1989). By the second grade children have generally been recognized as having a reading difficulty, and have been referred for assessment and remedial support. By the third grade, as noted above, children may start to fall behind their peers in other subject areas as well (Lloyd et al., 1991). A possible consequence is that, if children fall behind in other areas, they will have less access than their peers to knowledge and information that provides the 'working material' for intelligence. Readers who have difficulties are not exposed to as much quality or quantity of print, and thus will be at an increased disadvantage as they get older. Unable to use reading effectively as a way to increase general knowledge and comprehension, they may demonstrate increasingly lower levels of verbal intelligence scores (Bruck, 1998; Stanovitch, 1986).

Accompanying Affective Difficulties

Weaknesses in early literacy may put children at risk in other subject areas and at a disadvantage to acquire general knowledge and understanding through reading. As well, as children continue to fall behind their peers in achievement if they are not provided with support in the early stages of literacy acquisition, they will soon begin to notice that they are not reading adequately. As they proceed through the elementary grades, students may note that they are failing at their prime job (to become a proficient reader). Repeated failure and frustration may then lead to negative views of their own competence (e.g., Bryan, 1986). The result may be that students lose interest in academics and by the middle of elementary school, reading has become extremely aversive for them (e.g., Juel, 1988). At the worst, these negative feelings of self-competence may lead to poor motivation and achievement which could continue in a negative spiral, potentially leading to school dropout.

Providing remediation to assist a student after learning difficulties are well established is extremely difficult. Children who have already failed when trying to learn may be anxious, doubt their own ability, and as a result may be very hesitant to try new learning tasks. They may demonstrate varying degrees of learned helplessness, due to the repeated failures in early learning. Their motivation, even if they do learn to read, may always be low and they will likely maintain negative feelings about their own ability as a proficient reader (Maden & Hillman, 1996).

Competencies of a Good Reader

As students increase in reading proficiency, they acquire a number of generalized competencies (Hiebert, 1994). These competencies are as follows:

Fluency. Proficient readers recognize words readily, and appear to read effortlessly. Their decoding skills are thus at an automatic level, so they are able to concentrate on attending to and enjoying the meaning of the passage (Laberge & Samuels, 1973).

World knowledge. Proficient readers use their world knowledge to construct meaning of what they read. They integrate their own knowledge and experiences with what they read in the text. As they become more sophisticated in their reading skills, they may be able to suspend their own beliefs and ideas, follow an author's argument, and acquire new world knowledge from the text.

Flexible strategy use. Proficient readers can adapt their reading techniques to suit the material that they are reading. Whether reading for leisure, or information, easy or difficult text, they adapt their decoding and comprehension strategies to make sense of the information as needed.

Motivation. Proficient readers gain reinforcement in varied ways from reading, for enjoyment, needed information, or new world information. Even emergent readers can quickly gain reinforcement from reading, as they begin to successfully decode the written text, and extract and assimilate their own experiences to construct meaning which is relevant and motivating for them.

Continued reading. Proficient readers will seek to continue reading, for various purposes. Hence, with continued practice, they will become increasingly skillful and pursue reading as a lifetime learning pursuit.

How We Become Proficient Readers

The process by which children learn to read is still considered to be controversial (Chall, 1983; Deno, 1997). Some researchers have suggested that reading is primarily a 'bottom-up' process of learning sub-skills; that is, reading comes about as a result of word recognition (Stanovitch, 1991). Others stated that reading is a 'top-down' process, dependent upon the knowledge brought to the text by the reader (e.g., Smith, 1981). In contrast to the other two constructs of reading acquisition, it has been argued that to be a successful reader, one must have both comprehension and an understanding of reading codes--including punctuation and word recognition (Durkin, 1979). Au (1993) suggested that individuals must learn a number of strategies in order to become a proficient reader. Proficiency would be determined by a number of factors including; the type of materials being read, familiarity of the reader with the topic, or depending upon the difficulty of the text, a reader may need to be familiar with a number of strategies to help him/herself decode or understand new and unfamiliar information (Padak & Rasinski, 1996).

Proficiency in learning to read is based upon three factors as described above: (a) how individuals feel about the materials, (b) how familiar they are with the content area, and (c) the degree of difficulty of the text (Millar, 1988). For example, some students seem to use their knowledge effectively when they read, whereas others do not. Some children seem to find learning to read easy, whereas others seem to find it extremely difficult. Weaker readers frequently seem to have difficulty in learning to

read, and as well, even when they have acquired some skills and strategies to help themselves, they continue to have difficulty in decoding and/or comprehension.

The method of instruction of literacy skills has also been surrounded by much debate (Chall, 1983; Felton, 1992). This is due in part to the diversity of theoretical perspectives and as a result, there is a wide diversity of assessment and instructional materials from which educators must select appropriate materials to meet the needs of the child(ren) with whom they will be working.

## Instructional Practices to Support Children-at Risk

Research has demonstrated that children fall behind due to a number of factors, including disadvantaged family circumstances, learning difficulties, cultural/language differences, or lack of exposure to reading and print in preschool years (Cazden, 1986; McGill-Franzen & Allington, 1991). Recommendations to strengthen the education and support for children in their early school years have been suggested to help children overcome the disadvantages and inequalities of social and domestic backgrounds (McGill-Franzen & Allington, 1991; Scottish Office Education and Industry Department, 1996).

Some provinces in Canada have implemented support for early intervention programs for children-at-risk, with the longitudinal goal of decreasing drop-out rates of high-school students. For example, between 1992 and 1994 the Quebec Ministry of Education offered financial support for project initiatives which would facilitate increased stay-in-school numbers of students. A large number of these projects focussed on early school-based intervention. The Ministry of Education in British Columbia in 1998 put extensive funding towards training of primary teachers about the Reading

Recovery instructional program, an early literacy intervention program designed to support children in grade one who are potentially at-risk (McBride, personal communication, 1998).

Nisbet and Watt (1994) argued that links between poverty and educational disadvantage are very strong and difficult to break. Results from their research on early learning closely linked cognitive development to social and emotional factors. They suggested that young children's needs are not separable from their family's needs. It was advocated that policy makers and practitioners need to take these factors into consideration and provide support for families-at-risk in order to facilitate successful outcomes as practical initiatives are put into place.

## Effectiveness of School-based Early Intervention Programs

It is recognized that there are a complexity of inter-related factors which affect children's acquisition of literacy skills. Due to the complexity of and interrelationships of factors, there are really no single-measure answers (Paterson, 1991). The efficacy of school-based early intervention programs has been questioned due to the seemingly controversial results of the long-term benefits of the early interventions. Some studies have documented that the benefits of early intensive intervention seemed to be lost after 2 to 3 years, potentially due at least in part to home factors (e.g., Hillman, 1996; Mortimore, 1991).

More recently, researchers (e.g., Hillman, 1996), have documented the results of longitudinal studies and suggested that early school-based intensive interventions do make a difference with regards to students staying in school. Additionally, it has been suggested that there were particular elements of the early intervention programs which

were considered essential to the efficacy of the intervention. These elements included but were not limited to the following factors: quality of teaching and learning, effective leadership and management of change, collaboration of a school-based team model, and formative, as well as summative evaluation of the intervention program (Hillman, 1996; Mortimore, 1991). The greatest contributing factor to students' success in school and interest in literacy seems to have been linked to the attitude and support of children's teachers (Hopkins, 1991; Maden & Hillman, 1991).

## Provision of School-Based Early Intervention Programs to Support Inclusion

Most school-based early intervention programs focus on prevention, as their goal is to prevent children's learning disabilities from emerging and to correct learning difficulties which have already been perceived (Slavin & Madden, 1989). There have been many early intervention methodologies and programs developed to support children potentially at-risk, with varied degrees of validity and program success. Two interventions well renowned in North America and internationally (Vaughn, Bos, & Schumm, 1997), are the Reading Recovery intervention program (Clay, 1985), and the Success for All program (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik 1996).

## Reading Recovery Intervention Program

The Reading Recovery intervention program developed in New Zealand in 1979, was originally designed to support low-achieving first-graders through the provision of daily individual tutoring (Clay, 1985; Pinnell, Fried, & Estice, 1991). The program requires specially trained teachers to implement the tutoring program. Tutoring intervention consists of daily sessions of 30 minutes for each child, and includes the

following elements; (a) child re-reads familiar book, (b) teacher analyzes reading by keeping a daily running record (miscue analysis), (c) letter identification activities if necessary, (d) child writes (generally 1 sentence per day) with emphasis on hearing the sounds of words, (e) child's sentence is 'cut-up' and then put back together, and (f) child is introduced to and attempts first reading of a new book (Pinnell et al., 1991).

The lowest achieving 20 percent of the children in kindergarten from the previous year are selected for individual tutoring intervention. Each child receives the individual tutoring for a period of 16-20 weeks on a daily basis. When it is determined that children's skills are at grade level, and that they have acquired the strategies important to be able to independently help themselves with comprehension and word recognition, they are discontinued from the intervention program. Ideally, the classroom teacher can then support the child back in the classroom, and further remedial help may not ever be needed.

The Success for All Intervention Program

The Success for All Program was designed at the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students at the John Hopkins University in Baltimore (Slavin et al., 1996). Success for All focusses on intervention from an entire school-based perspective with children from kindergarten through to grade three. It is anticipated that due to many factors, from socio-economic status, to multi-ethnicity, a significant number of children may be at-risk for poor literacy achievement. Success for All was designed to support these children-at-risk in a preventive manner through the provision of enriched literacy support for each student from when he/she entered school in kindergarten, through to and including the third grade. Success of the intervention

was defined as all children achieving to grade level in reading skills by the completion of third grade. The specific goal was to see all children demonstrate reading improvement. Multi-faceted in nature, the Success for All program intervention program encompasses the following elements, with the goal of protecting children from various risk factors: (a) enriched preschool provision for all children, (b) pre-prepared sequential curricular reading materials for all levels of language arts intervention, (c) smaller sized, ability-based cross-grade reading instructional groups, (d) family-support team to intervene with families as needed, and (e) one-to-one tutoring in reading, accessible for children in grades one through three who are falling behind (Slavin et al.).

The Success for All Intervention program is a school-based intervention model and involvement of all of the teachers and students is needed, from kindergarten level through to the third grade. Prior to the adoption of the program, at least 80 percent of the staff members of a school must vote in favor of implementation of the Success for All program.

Continued support for children from grades four through six, is available through a reading intervention component. This intervention is based on the same model as the primary literacy program, and offers decreased class sizes and same-ability groupings. As the major element of the program is based on the primary intervention for children in grades one to three, the focus of this paper is on the primary program intervention.

Efficacy of the Program Elements of Success for All and Reading Recovery

There have been many formal and informal first grade prevention programs developed on the premise that success in the first grade, particularly in literacy, will

facilitate success later in school. The majority of these programs have demonstrated short-term immediate success. However, rarely have any longitudinal assessments been done to determine their continued efficacy (Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989). Unfortunately, as noted previously, there are many conflicting factors in children's lives which may affect their ability to retain the benefits of the short-term intensive intervention. Teachers have noted that frequently when children return to school after a summer vacation, all the of the gains they made previously with intensive intervention are lost (Nielson, personal communication, 1998).

The two literacy early intervention programs described above, Reading Recovery, and Success for All are particularly well known internationally (Vaughn etal., 1997). As each intervention program was developed to meet certain goals, there are pros and cons for both of the intervention programs, which provide for interesting and informative comparisons. In the following section, a comparison of some of these elements is be made. The aim is not to say that either the Reading Recovery program is more effective than the Success for All program, or vice versa. Choice of which intervention program, if any, to utilize, would depend upon the nature of the circumstances where it was to be implemented. The areas which will be focussed on for comparison include the following elements: (a) development and growth of each of the programs in Canada, (b) teacher training and support, (c) theoretical focus, (d) methods of assessment and instructional Intervention, (e) tutoring component, (f) parental involvement and support, and (g) efficacy and longitudinal benefits (see Table 4.1 for a summary of comparisons).

Development and Growth of the Programs in Canada

The Reading Recovery Intervention Program as stated above, was developed in

Table 4.1

Reading Recovery and Success for All Compared.

| Elements for Comparison | Reading Recovery | Success for All |
|---|---|---|
| Development in Canada | Well developed-throughout Canada | Only beginning in Canada |
| Teacher training and support | Intensive and time consuming | More relaxed, fits into PD days in year |
| Theoretical focus | Combination of bottom-up, and top down, teaches strategies | Combination, as per Reading Recovery |
| Methods of assessment and Instructional intervention | Diagnostic criterion referenced assessment, direct instruction | Standardized assessments, followed by informal curriculum based. Direct instruction, group, same ability |
| Tutoring component | Focus of intervention-very structured | Tutoring is 'remedial' component of program. Possibly weakest link |
| Parental involvement and support | Needed, but no support provided | Needed, Family Support Team available for support |
| Efficacy and longitudinal benefits | Controversial, may facilitate staying-in-school | Controversial, may facilitate long-term staying-in-school |

New Zealand in 1979. It did not become popular in Canada until the late 1980's. Initially, teachers were required to travel elsewhere, such as Ohio, or England to receive the required training for implementation of the Reading Recovery program.

Finally, in 1993-94, the first Canadian Teacher training site was opened, at the University of Toronto in Scarborough. The first year 10 candidates were trained as teacher leaders, at a tuition cost of $8000.00 per candidate. Following the year of intensive training, they went back to their own school boards and trained other teachers through a practicum-based program. Interest in this intervention model continued, and there is now a western training site based in Winnipeg.

The Success for All intervention was developed in Baltimore in the mid- 1980's (Slavin et al., 1996), in response to a school superintendent's request for a program intervention to support the literacy needs of many children-at-risk. The model has been extensively researched within the research site, and is slowly gaining international awareness as a comprehensive holistic inclusive model of support. Presently there are only two program sites in Canada, both in Montreal. In 1994, the principal of Hampstead School in Montreal, sought to implement a school-based intervention program to support the high rate of children with special needs at her school. She approached Concordia University to be involved so that they could implement this program. In 1995, Hampstead School became the first Canadian school to be involved. In the fall of 1998, a second school in Montreal implemented the Success for All intervention program for the first time. Concordia University has continued its collaboration with the schools, and with John Hopkins University in Baltimore.

Teacher Training and Support

The two intervention programs present strong contrasts in their methodologies of teacher training. The Reading Recovery model of intervention requires teachers to receive an intensive year of training and guided support. The key elements of the training include: (a) presentation of the theory relevant to Reading Recovery, (b) demonstration of teaching methodologies and strategies to support the learning theory, (c) practice in simulated or classroom settings, (d) open-ended peer feedback and coaching, and (e) specific data recording and evaluation of progress observed with each child, followed up by inter-observer monitoring when a child is discontinued from the program (Clay, 1985).

Clay (1985) noted that in order for intervention to be effective, this length, and intensity of training was necessary. As well, continued support, and teacher development in subsequent years has been mandatory to maintain one's certification (Pinnell et al. 1991). The downside to this intensive schedule is that in addition to doing a half-time guided practicum with children for the Reading Recovery program, teachers-in-training are generally teaching a different group of children for the other half of their schedule. Planning for two diverse teaching situations may be time consuming and stressful. For some teachers it may be difficult to be able to schedule the theoretical training and data recording, along with their other teaching duties and personal responsibilities.

The Success for All teacher training does not seem as intensive, and is provided strategically on three or four occasions throughout the year, generally on professional development days. Teachers are provided with the same depth of content and reference

material as in the Reading Recovery teacher-training, although there is not the same opportunity or pressure to practice each component of the intervention. As there are many roles within the Success for All intervention, all teachers within a school will be involved in a certain element of training relevant to their expected role. A teacher-facilitator from each school is trained to be the role-model and leader, so that support and feedback is available to all teachers in a school on an ongoing basis.

The program design of Success for All may lead to a potential weakness regarding the teaching component. An important instructional element of the Success for All program lies in the daily regrouping of students in the primary grades so that students receive language arts instruction in smaller groups with others at the same skill level. This requires an increased number of teachers however, for 90 minutes a day. If a sufficient number of teachers is not available, teacher assistants may take on the role of a teacher and be responsible for literacy instruction for a group of 15-20 children per day. Teacher assistants may be excellent instructors, yet they were hired as assistants, not teachers, as they do not have the necessary training to be certified as teachers. Although most assistants are likely excellent in that role, the potential exists that they do not have sufficient training and leadership experience to recognize errors and unaccounted variables that could negatively affect the instructional intervention.

## Theoretical Perspectives

Both Reading Recovery and Success for All utilize the same theoretical framework to guide their program interventions. As Au (1993) suggested, successful readers are those who bring their own knowledge to the text and as well make use of progressive skills they have learned to aid them with word recognition, hence utilizing

strategies from both 'top-down', and 'bottom-up' processes. The goal of the intervention of both models is to teach children to utilize their previous knowledge effectively, and to teach them relevant cues or learning several strategies which they can use to help themselves with their word recognition skills and/or comprehension when they encounter difficulties in understanding or decoding new words. The goal of both program interventions is to provide children with the confidence, knowledge basis, and skills to be able to become successful independent readers.

Methods of Assessment and Instructional Intervention

The Success for All and the Reading Recovery models of intervention, although similar in their theoretical perspectives, offer differing frameworks of intervention at the program level. The Reading Recovery intervention is focussed on direct intensive one-to-one tutoring to support the lowest achieving students in grade one (Clay (1985). The program mandates that the intervention is to support children in grade one, who are 6 years old. The instructional intervention could easily be adapted for children who are older, or in more advanced grades. However it is likely that in order to be able to maintain the intent of the intervention--preventive intensive support in literacy development, the parameters of grade and age eligibility were set.

The diagnostic assessments utilized in this intervention model were designed specifically for the Reading Recovery program. They incorporate several sub-tests on a range of skills, as the goal is to provide a comprehensive picture of a child's level of literacy awareness and skill level. The program model then requires the Reading Recovery teacher to work informally with a child for 10 sessions before starting formal teaching. The intent here is for a teacher is to gain a holistic picture of how each child is

performing, their willingness to risk-take, their personal interests, and so on. However, as the assessment is criterion-referenced in nature, the extended length of this informal intervention period seems unnecessary. As Hoyson, Jamieson, Strain, and Smith (1998) suggested from their own outreach experience, it is important to be rid of the distinction between assessment and instruction of learning outcomes, as they are continuous activities. Ongoing monitoring and assessment allows teachers to offer precise instructions and feedback, at the specific skill level of a child. It would seem that in an individualized teaching setting such as the Reading Recovery tutoring program, ongoing assessment and teaching of the learning outcomes would be the goal of the instructional model.

Instruction is offered to children for one half hour each day. The instructional focus is derived directly from the results of the assessment, and the teacher works with a child to help him/her develop metacognitive strategies and skills, and become increasingly independent. Reading and writing are taught hand-in-hand for a portion of the lesson each day. Children's learning is monitored and recorded each day, as they read a familiar story, and a miscue analysis is kept. The rate of progress for each child is based on an individual's own learning rate, as are the teaching cues, and instructional goals. Children are taught comprehension, word recognition, and learning strategies within the context of the stories that they read. The use of familiar texts, and specific instructional techniques which incorporate phonemic awareness and strategy usage to help children learn to self-correct, facilitates increased efficacy of the instructional model.

A potential weakness may evolve as children are discontinued from the program, and return to their regular classroom language arts program. It has been documented extensively over the years that it is necessary to teach children to transfer and generalize their learning to new situations ( eg.,McLean & Odem, 1993). The step from one-to-one assistance and support, to a whole class setting is too large for many children to make at an emergent reading level. Clay (1985) acknowledged that "decisions to discontinue should be made very carefully" (p.82). She suggested that a Reading Recovery teacher could monitor a child's progress every 2 weeks for the first while that a child has been discontinued from the intensive support. Alternatively, the Reading Recovery teacher could work with the child in the classroom for a few weeks when he/she initially is discontinued (Clay). Unfortunately, many Reading Recovery teachers simply do not have the time to continue assessing children periodically once they have been discontinued. A Reading Recovery teacher may be able realistically to spend a few sessions in the regular classroom, but it is likely that two weeks cannot be accommodated. Other means to bridge this learning step may include peer tutoring, or short-term tutoring support with a small group of children, which would gradually disseminate into the larger classroom group instruction. However, if this type of support is not carried out at the initiative of the parents or teacher, then a child may quickly lose the skills that he has just acquired.

The Success for All Intervention program takes a different focus at the program level. All teachers receive training before the children begin back at school in the fall. When children start the new school year they are placed in homerooms according to their age and grade level, and will generally receive instruction with that group for all

classes except Language Arts. During the Language Arts time, which is scheduled at the same time for all children in grades one to three, each child is initially assessed on his/her reading level with a standardized diagnostic assessment, such as the Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery (Woodcock, 1997), or Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Durrell & Catterson, 1980). These assessments provide scores on some of the component skills in reading including pre-reading skills, word recognition, as well as comprehension.

Children are then regrouped into class sizes of 15 to 20 children for the daily language arts time with peers who are at approximately the same level of reading skills. In these groups, children receive instruction with materials designed by the researchers which include whole language-based reading activities, basal readers, exercises, and activities. Each day children receive 90 minutes of language arts instruction, which has been broken into three segments. A direct instructional model is used to teach components of comprehension, and word recognition. There is a focus on phonemic awareness, as well as the modeling and instruction of metacognitive strategies for children to be able to utilize as they read independently.

Every 8 weeks children are reassessed on their reading skills. If the reading levels of the children within a group have changed they are regrouped, as the goal is to have children grouped with other children who are at the same or similar reading level. If it is determined that a child is falling behind rather than progressing, he/she would be eligible to receive individual tutoring until the child demonstrated consistent improvement at an appropriate rate. The tutor would ideally be a teacher who had received specific instructional strategies during a pre-session training workshop;

however, in the event that a qualified teacher was not available, a volunteer would be utilized.

It is documented that tutors will work with children on materials that they have been using in their group instructional program (Slavin et al., 1996). This is in contrast to the Reading Recovery instructional intervention which focusses on the use of stories which are at the child's instructional level of learning. Slavin et al. (1996) suggested that children would have an opportunity to practice classroom learning through the provision of individual tutoring. However, by the time some children receive tutoring, their skills are significantly below the level of the materials being read in the classroom. Tutors who have worked with the program intervention have suggested that the expectation of Slavin et al. (1996) is unrealistic. They suggested that they usually have to find an easier set of materials for working with children on a tutoring basis (Teacher discussion, Success for All workshop, March, 1998).

The focus of the program is to teach the children to read. All measures utilized to determine children's progress, or the overall effectiveness of the intervention utilize reading scores across each grade level as the dependent variable. As literacy encompasses the acquisition of reading and writing, it seems logical to focus on the instruction and evaluation of both components of literacy learning, as does the Reading Recovery intervention. Writing skills are taught within the Success for All intervention program; however the focus is on the acquisition of reading skills.

The Tutoring Component

It may be observed therefore, that the Success for All model of intervention and the Reading Recovery approach follow the same or similar theoretical perspectives

about reading acquisition and the importance of direct instruction to support children-at-risk. The focus of the intervention and goals of the programs differ, however. Reading Recovery aims to target the lowest achieving 20 percent of the grade one students, and Success for All focusses on the provision of a school-based intervention program, to support all of the children in the primary grades towards achievement in reading.

Through the provision of a very structured tutoring intervention program the Reading Recovery intervention program focusses on accelerating the progress of those children who would have likely become candidates for special education services in the near future. It is hoped through systematic individualized intervention that the majority of these children will not ever need intervention again.

Alternatively, the Success for All intervention program was designed to prevent potential interference of varied factors that are known to interfere with children's learning. Along with developing a systematic reading program intervention for all children in a school, the researchers of Success for All incorporated a family support team to be available to support, and educate parents as needed. A tutoring component was included as a part of the program intervention; however it was meant to be a support to children who continued to be-at-risk within the language arts systematic instructional classes.

It was noted through analysis of the Success for All program intervention that although the same-ability, small-group instruction was perceived to be effective, there were still children who benefited from one-to-one tutoring. As the tutoring instructional intervention was much more clearly defined in the Reading Recovery program than in the

Success for All program, some schools took on both intervention programs, and utilize the Success for All program intervention for the entire school, and the Reading Recovery intervention as the tutoring component for the children who are severely-at-risk (Slavin et al., 1996).

Parental Involvement

It is frequently stated that children's learning is directly influenced by their home environment, and that at times the benefits attained through enriched school-based interventions may be lost due to a lack of support from the home (Hillman, 1996). The Reading Recovery intervention focusses exclusively on a tutoring intervention model. An expectation for each child is that they will practice reading their book at home each night for 10 to 15 minutes, and parents will sign to certify that they heard the child read. In order for a child to participate in the Reading Recovery intervention program, parents must acknowledge their support in writing. Potentially a child could be blocked from receiving this intervention, if the parents do not authorize support. There are many reasons why parents might not acknowledge support for the program, which could include cultural differences, differing expectations of the home and school, English-as-a-second-language, or a lack of time. Some educators would find a way for a child to practice at school, whereas others may not allow a child to participate in the program due to a lack of parental support.

The Success for All program was developed to support children-at-risk and to try to prevent risk factors from interfering with a child's learning. Family support is offered as an informal intervention, available to parents and families on an as need basis. For example, if it was perceived that a child is at risk for any potential reason the school

based team would meet with the parents to provide support, and constructive feedback. The goal would always be to develop strategies to help the child cope with or overcome a situation or difficulty.

The complexity of factors affecting children's educational attainment is still not clearly understood. It is recognized that children's needs are not separable from their family's needs, as research on early learning links cognitive development to social and emotional factors (Nisbet & Watt, 1994). Hence, as programs are developed and implemented to support children-at-risk, it is becoming increasingly apparent that support must be provided to children from a holistic perspective in order for effective literacy learning to take place.

## Efficacy and Longitudinal Benefits of Reading Recovery and Success for All

The efficacy of both the Reading Recovery Intervention and Success for All Intervention programs on a short-term basis has been documented as being highly effective (e.g. Fraser, 1998). It has been questioned if the benefits of these early intervention programs are maintained on a long-term basis. Hillman (1996) noted that although direct academic benefits may not be observable over time, there is an increased correlation of at-risk students who complete school who received early school-based intervention over those who did not. As well, the involvement of teachers seems to be a crucial element in determining the success of a program intervention. Clay herself (1985) claimed that Reading Recovery was only effective when a change occurred in four ways. This change would include the following elements: (a) behavioral change on the part of the teachers, (b) child behavior change achieved by teaching, (c) organizational changes in schools, and (d) social and political changes in

financing by controlling authorities. The implication of this would be that an intervention program must be imbedded in a wider context of changes in order to effect success on a long term basis.

The Success for All Intervention program made attempts to facilitate a school-wide program change through the regrouping of instruction for Language Arts, focus on Cooperative Learning, Family Support Team, and Tutoring Support available as needed. However, there was no assessment conducted by the researchers as to the impact and benefit of each of the intervention components, or the cumulative effect of the intervention components (Lister-Bauer, 1998). Possibly one of the intervention components isn't really needed or alternatively, perhaps the family support should be a formal versus informal intervention.

Hence, more research is needed to determine the key factors in facilitating learning and school success for all students. Each of the programs aims to achieve different goals although the intent, to provide effective early literacy support for children-at-risk is the same.

## Summary

In summary, the Reading Recovery and the Success for All intervention programs provide examples of two internationally recognized early intervention programs designed to support children-at-risk in their literacy learning. Extensive research by the researchers of each program has attempted to ensure efficacy of each of the program elements. Increasingly research is being conducted in other program and research sites as well, which will add to the credibility of each of the program models. Earlier it was

stated that the comparisons made between the programs was not meant to identify one as being more effective than the other. Each program intervention focusses on the support of children-at-risk from a different perspective. Implementation of both program models at one site, as was described briefly may be a way to utilize the strengths of both interventions.

As was concluded by Fraser (1998) in her review of early intervention initiatives, a number of factors to facilitate successful program intervention include: (a) development of a comprehensive or holistic intervention to address the many interconnecting needs of children, (b) intervening early, preferably when children are in grade one, (c) ensuring that appropriate staff development is offered to teachers, and (d) ensuring contact and involvement of parents and other outside agencies to provide a broader framework of intervention and support (p. 10). Reading Recovery and Success for All interventions both address each of the above factors to varying degrees.

As the inclusion of all children in regular class settings is equated with the concept of equal opportunity for all, teachers need increased training, as well as pedagogical and curricular supports to be able to meet the needs of all children. Reading Recovery and Success for All provide two examples of ways to provide these supports. As these program interventions continue to be implemented it is hoped that researchers and practitioners will affirm elements of effectiveness, yet challenge their efficacy, so that they will continue to be refined and developed in order to help all children achieve their potential.

## References

Au,,K.(1993). Literacy instruction in multicultural settings. Fort Worth: TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.

Bruck, M. (1998). Outcomes of adults with childhood histories of dyslexia. In C. Hulme & R. Joshi (Eds.) Reading and spelling: Development and disorders (pp. 179-200). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bryan, T. (1986). Self-concept and attributions of the learning disabled. Learning Disabilities Focus, 1, 82-89.

Cazden, C. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. Wittrock (Ed). Handbook of research on teaching. ( pp.432-463).New York: McMillan.

Chall, J. (1983). Learning to read: The great debate.(rev.ed.) San Francisco: McGraw Hill.

Clay, M. (1985) The Early Detection of Reading Difficulties, 3rd ed. Auckland: Heinemann.

Deno, S. (1997). Whether thou goest....Perspectives on progress monitoring. In J. Lloyd, E. Kameenui, & D. Chard (Eds.).Issues in educating students with disabilities.(pp. 77-99). Mahwah NJ: Erlbaum.

Durkin, D.(1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 14, 481-533.

Durrell, D. & Catterson, J. (1980). Durrell analysis of reading difficulty. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Felton, R. (1992) Early identification of a child at risk for reading disabilities. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 12, 212-229.

Fraser, H. (1998). Early intervention: Key issues from research. Interchange, 50, 1-12. Scottish Office for Education & Industry Development.

Hiebert, E. (1994). Reading Recovery in the United States: What difference does it make to an age cohert? Educational Researcher, 23 (9), 15-25.

Hillman, J. (1996). Introduction: the challenge of disadvantage. In National Commission on Education. Success against the odds. London: Routledge.

Hopkins, D. (1991). Changing school culture through development planning. In S. Riddell & S. Brown, (eds). School effectiveness research: Its Messages for school improvement. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Hoyson, M., Jamieson, B., Strain, P., & Smith, B. (1998). Duck, duck--Colors and words: Early childhood inclusion. Teaching Exceptional Children, March/April, 1998, 66-71.

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read & write: A longitudinal study of fifty-four children from first to fourth grade. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 437-447.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. (1973). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 6, 293-303.

Lister-Bauer, S. (1998). Effectiveness of the "Success for All" program model. Exceptionality Education Canada, 7 (1&2 1997), 69-86.

Lloyd, J., Kaufman, J., Landrum, T., & Roe, D. (1991). Why do teachers refer pupils for special education? An analysis of referral records. Exceptionality, 2, 115-126.

Maden, M. & Hillman, J. (1996). Lessons in Success, National Commission on Education, 1996. Success against the odds. London: Routledge

McBride, Dr. S. Ministry of Education of British Columbia, personal communication, September, 1998.

McLean, M., & Odem, S. (1993). Practices for Young Children with and without disabilities. A comparison of DEC & NAEYC identified practices. Topics in Early childhood & Special Education, 13, 274-292.

McGill-Franzen, A.& Allington, R. (1990). Comprehension and coherence: Neglected elements of literacy instruction in remedial and resource room services. Journal of Reading, Writing and Learning Disabilities, 6, 149-180.

Millar, W. (1988). Reading teacher's complete diagnosis and correction manual. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Mortimore, P. (1991). School effectiveness research: Its messages for school improvement. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Nielson, C. (1998) Classroom teacher, Western Quebec School Board, personal communication, Quebec, Canada, December, 1997.

Nisbet, J. & Watt, J. (1994). Educational disadvantage in Scotland: A 1990'a perspective. Edinburgh: Scottish Community Education Council.

Padak, N. & Rasinski, T. (1996). Holistic reading strategies: Teaching children who find reading difficult. USA: Englewood Cliffs.

Paterson, L. (1991). Socio-economic status and educational attainment: a Multi-dimensional study. Evaluation and Research in Education, 5, (3), 97-121.

Pinnel, G., Fried, M.,& Estice, R. (1991). Reading recovery: Learning how to make a difference. In D. DeFord, C. Lyons, & G. Pinnell, eds. Bridges to Literacy: Learning from reading recovery. USA: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Scottish Office and Industry Department, (1996). Improving achievement in Scottish schools, A report to the Secretary of State for Scotland. Edinburgh: HMSO.

Slavin, R., Karweit, N., & Madden, N. (1989). Effective programs for students-at-risk. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R. & Madden, N. (1989). What works for students at risk: A research analysis. Educational Leadership, 2, 4-13.

Slavin, R., Madden, N., Dolan. L.,& Wasik, B. (1996). Every child, every school: Success for all. California: Corwin Press.

Slavin, R., Dolan, L. & Madden, N. (1994). Scaling up: lessons learned in the dissemination of Success for All. Report No. 46. Baltimore, MD: Centre for Research on Effective schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Smith, W. (1981). The potential and problems of sentence combining. English Journal, 70, (6), 79-81.

Stanovitch, K. (1986).Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 360-407.

Stanovitch, K. (1991). Discrepancy definitions of reading disability: Has intelligence led us astray? Reading Research Quarterly, 26, 7-29.

Teacher discussion. (1998). Workshop on the implementation of Success for All, Learning Disabilities Association of Quebec-International Conference, Montreal, March 21, 1998.

Vaughn, S., Bos, C. & Schumm, J. (1997). Teaching mainstreamed, diverse, and at-risk students in the general classroom. Boston: Allyn & Bacon .

Woodcock, R. (1997). Woodcock diagnostic reading battery. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

107

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI

RUNNING HEAD: Narratives of Youth with ADHD

# CHAPTER V

# NARRATIVES OF YOUTH WITH ADHD FROM DIFFERING EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL SETTINGS-- THEIR EXPERIENCES OF SCHOOL

## Abstract

The aim of this inquiry was to gain an understanding of the nature of the actual inclusionary practices that exist for children with special needs--in particular behavior disorders--in Canada and Germany, two highly developed countries. In order to gain an awareness and understanding of how students may have perceived their school experiences, four students with identified externalizing behavior disorders and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, each from a differing educational and cultural setting, were interviewed about their experiences of school. The students were from two provinces in Canada; Quebec, and Alberta, and two states in Germany; Bavaria, and Brandenburg. This paper highlights, through the use of a narrative analysis approach, each of the students' stories and give insights about the impact of differing environments on the children's beliefs and experiences. As well, the essence of inclusion from the students' perspectives is discussed, challenging teacher educators to reflect on ways to be better able to welcome each child, regardless of their abilities or disabilities, as an important member of the classroom community.

In recent years, enhancing the educational experiences for children with special needs has become an international priority insofar as 85 countries in 1994, including Canada and Germany, attested their commitment to the International Salamanca Declaration on inclusive non-discriminatory education for all (UNESCO, 1994). The Salamanca Declaration proclaims that regular schools with an inclusive orientation are the most effective means through which to combat discriminatory attitudes, create welcoming communities, and achieve effective education for all (UNESCO, 1994, para.2). It has been suggested (Ainscow, 1994; Gerber, 1995) that the Salamanca Declaration may be seen as the ideology of inclusive education. Hence, the philosophy of inclusion has begun to spread well beyond the developed countries, and is now being presented as the model that developing countries should adopt in establishing educational services for children with special needs. The status of inclusion at a program level in developed countries cannot be taken for granted though, based upon the development of policies advocating inclusion. In order to determine if inclusion is in place at a program level, the efficacy of practice needs to be evaluated, particularly from the perspective of those to be included--the children themselves.

## The Development of Inclusion as a Reflection of Society's Values

Regardless of whether or not inclusion has been articulated at the national and/or provincial/state policy level, the actual practices at a school-based, or classroom level may or may not (yet) reflect inclusive practices. Inclusion advocates might argue that yet more radical forms of school policy, school organization, or professional development must take place in order for practices to become inclusive (Ainscow,

1994). It must be recognized however, that the philosophy of inclusion did not come about from a sudden realization and recognition of human rights. Rather, it has developed out of the integration movement which has historical, cultural, and political roots (Carroll, 1992; Gold, Bowe, & Ball, 1993). It is likely then, as the philosophy and practice of inclusion has evolved historically, that it will evolve further. As Skrtic, (1991) suggested, society's responses to meet the educational needs of diverse learners is a historical process which has been, and will continue to be constructed and reconstructed.

It has been suggested that the state of practices in schools is really a reflection of broader social values and policies of a nation or state (Carroll, 1992). Slee (1996) stated that inclusion in schools really reflects our values today regarding human rights, issues of poverty, and acceptance of individuals with disabilities, or minority racial groups. If inclusion is viewed as a dynamic multi-faceted process, the complexities and compromises towards inclusion may be better understood. We may be better able to evaluate varying forms of educational provision, not from an absolute 'inclusive' or 'not inclusive' framework, but from a multifaceted perspective, which would suggest that a certain method/setting is more, or less inclusive than another (Booth, 1995; Stangyik 1997).

## The Salamanca Declaration on Inclusion

The Salamanca Documentation on Inclusion (UNESCO, 1994), reinforces the perspective that schools are really a reflection of society, as it was suggested that "...regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of

combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society, and achieving education for all..." (UNESCO, 1994, para . 2). With the multiplicity of family structures, ethnic groups, cultures, and abilities that is represented in schools today, one of the greatest challenges facing teachers is to provide all children with opportunities to achieve to their potentials. However, rather than evaluating programs according to whether or not children are physically included, a more comprehensive approach would evaluate children's progress in all areas of learning (social/emotional and skill based).

Currently, inclusive education dominates the international agenda regarding education for children with special needs (Ainscow, 1994). It has been advocated as the model for developing countries to utilize as they establish educational provisions for children with special needs. A logical assumption that follows this directive would be that inclusive practices have been well established in developed countries, and that the inclusion movement has experienced success as per the goals as established by the Salamanca Declaration on inclusion (UNESCO,1994).

The Status of Inclusion in Canada and Germany

If the assumption from above was assumed accurate, it could be perceived that countries such as Canada, and Germany, representing two of the more highly developed countries in the world would be able to provide examples of how inclusion has been effectively implemented at a program level. Yet Germany has seen much greater political strife than has Canada. The former East Germany suffered through societal segregation and suppression following the Second World War, until 1989. It may be

hypothesized that these political factors have had a significant effect on the development of the inclusion movement in Germany, particularly in the former East.

Theoretically, the structure of the education systems in Canada and Germany is similar. Neither Canada nor Germany has federally operated offices of Education. Thus, decisions regarding the type of educational services to be offered to children with special needs are made at a provincial or state level (Lister-Bauer, 1998). The ideology of inclusion has been documented by the provision of a national declaration in both countries. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms 1982 (1986), sets the theme for inclusive education in Canada, as it states that every individual is equal before and under the law and that every individual is to be protected from discrimination (section 15, 1986). This has ramification for inclusive practices, particularly from a human rights perspective. The Canadian School Act follows on this theme, as it states that accommodations must be made for children with special needs at a local level (Canadian School Executive, p.3). In 1973, the German government put forth a statement (Deutschen Bildungsrat, 1974) which stated that integration is to be favored over segregation. However, in both countries as stated above, policies are developed at a provincial or state level, and even then, inclusionary practices are determined at the school or classroom level influenced by many political, social, and historical interconnecting factors.

The Nature of Inclusionary Practices

It was previously stated that Canada and Germany have demonstrated their commitment towards the education and inclusion of all children, through their participation and ratification of the Salamanca Declaration (UNESCO, 1994). It is

perceived however, that the degree of inclusion at a school or classroom-based level will differ extensively in Canada and Germany, due to the varied political and cultural factors which have affected these countries over the last 50 or so years.

To determine the efficacy of the status of inclusion at a school or classroom-based level, it seems appropriate to listen to students' perspectives about their experiences. Dahl (1995) suggested that students' voices help us understand what they need and value as learners. Taylor (1993) asserted that the potential of children to participate in the construction of their own learning environment and evaluate their experiences has been underestimated. It has been said that they are the "only authentic chroniclers of their own experience" (Delpit, 1998, p.297), and yet at times teachers and researchers have left them out as their needs were being evaluated (Erickson & Schultz, 1992).

In order to provide some insights into the nature of inclusionary practices for children with special needs, specifically regarding children with behavior disorders in Canada and Germany, the voices of students were sought to learn about their perceptions of their experiences of school. Four settings (two states in Germany; Bavaria, and Brandenburg; and two provinces in Canada; Alberta, and Quebec) were selected for inquiry and comparison. Geographical distances and political/historical/cultural diversity have resulted in differing philosophies and policies regarding the education of children with special needs, as was documented in a previous article (Lister Bauer, 1998).

## Approach to the Inquiry

The aim of this inquiry was to gain an understanding of the nature of the inclusionary practices for children with special needs in each of the four settings. As the goal was to gain an understanding of the experiences of students with special needs in school, an ethnographic analysis of their perspectives would facilitate an understanding of these students' experiences (Oldfather, 1995, p.86). As the goal for all qualitative inquiries is to maintain a perspective on the lived human experience, the skills needed were those "that have always made strong teachers: observation, the ability to hear well and deeply, or to simply listen, the ability to ask good questions, and the ability to deconstruct the texts of student life--interviewing (conversations with purposes), observation, and the willingness to listen to the artifacts of others' existence as embodying meanings in their lives" (Lincoln, 1995, p.93).

A purposeful sample (Merriam, 1988) of four students, one from each of the settings, was selected from the two provinces in Canada: Alberta and Quebec; and two states in Germany: Brandenburg and Bavaria. The students were all 12 years of age and had been assessed as having attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Through a series of open-ended interviews, students shared their perspectives of their elementary school experiences--factors which had been most important for them and their suggestions for teachers to make classroom learning more effective for all children.

The goal of the inquiry was to present a narrative analysis of the experiences of each student in its entirety, to facilitate the sharing of the diverse experiences with other educators (Polkinghorne, 1995). Presentation of each of the students' accounts as a separate story would facilitate an understanding of the degree of inclusiveness of each

of the settings and how the diverse cultures and/or policies had impacted upon each student's experiences. Additionally, narrative analysis approach may potentially facilitate educators to become increasingly sensitive to the individual needs of each of their students.

## Methodology

### Overview of a Qualitative Approach

As an educator and a researcher, it was my goal to gain a better understanding of the nature of the educational practices in the four differing cultural and educational settings and their degree of 'inclusiveness' as perceived by the student participants. It was my hope, that by having a better understanding the experiences of youth-at-risk in school, I and perhaps others would become more sensitive to their needs and thus be better able to facilitate true inclusionary experiences for all students.

In light of this goal, this approach provided a philosophical framework that helped construct an understanding of the experiences of the participants. Objectivity means staying focused on the object of the inquiry; that the researcher is intent on showing it, describing it, and interpreting it without being sidetracked or misled by extraneous elements. Subjectivity means that one needs to be as insightful and as perceptive as possible in order to disclose the object of inquiry in depth without, as van Manen (1992) stated, becoming "...arbitrary, self-indulgent, or captivated and carried away by our unreflected preconceptions" (p.20).

### Assumptions and Limitations

As an educator and researcher who was educated and received the majority of my professional experience in North America, I tend to perceive the world, particularly

the educational environment, through a North American lens. Hence, it would be my tendency to make assumptions unknowingly from this frame of reference. I came to conscious awareness of this prior to the process of information collecting and analysis. As a result, I consciously sought to develop an unbiased ecological foundation of knowledge of each setting; by living in each setting for an extended period of time, extensive self-reflection, and self-monitoring as per documented analyses regarding cross-cultural and comparative methodologies (Lincoln, 1993; Stronach & MacLure, 1997). As well, as documented in the data analysis sub-section, precautions were taken to reference my interpretations of the data with both the participants and with a research assistant from each of the settings.

The assumption was made that generally when students who reach 12 years of age, they are able to articulate their thoughts and feelings into words in a reliable manner. Basing this assumption on a developmental learning framework, qualitative researchers have suggested that the minimum age for interviewing students is 10 years old (Powers, Singer, & Todes 1996; Siegler, 1991). Hence, it was perceived that by selecting students of the same age and grade, with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, commonality of the subjects' characteristics could facilitate some comparisons of the differing educational and cultural settings.

Trustworthiness

The foundation of interpretation in qualitative studies is through triangulated empirical materials which are trustworthy. Trustworthiness has been defined as having the components of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Denzin, 1994; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). To ensure trustworthiness of the inquiry,

strategies as described below were used to ensure that the inquiry warranted its own authoritative representation of the question being studied (Lincoln & Denzin, 1994).

Credibility or data triangulation may be obtained through the use of a variety of data sources (Janesick, 1994), or use of multiple methods to study the question (Morse, 1994). In this study, participant interviews recorded on cassette tape were the major source of data collection. However, in order to ensure credibility of this source, other methods including field notes by the researcher, participant observations, and consultations with the school directors and children's teachers, recorded through field notes and cassette tapes, facilitated data triangulation.

Transferability of the inquiry was obtained through rich descriptions of each participant source (Vidich & Lyman, 1994). Careful and detailed description of each data source will allow for the comparison of the results of this inquiry with others which match it in theme, design, and nature of population sample. Matching of the participants on age, grade, and nature of special need facilitated increased dependability of the inquiry. Hence, by matching the subject (n) characteristics, emerging patterns of commonalities experienced by the subjects across settings may allow us to make/or develop generalizations regarding students' experiences in school.

Confirmability, or clarification of the researcher bias was described above. Additionally, it was documented how the researcher consciously made efforts and constant checks to minimize her biases and to ensure that interpretation of the data was as value free as possible.

## Ethical Considerations

The issues of informed consent, right to privacy, and protection from harm are all ethical considerations which were addressed in the research proposal and application for approval to the Research Ethics Committee of the Educational Psychology Department, University of Alberta. Subsequently, permission to conduct the study was obtained in each of the other settings. Prior to obtaining permission from participants, approval of the study was sought and obtained at a school board and school level. Additionally, in Germany it was mandated that permission from the Ministers of Education responsible for the educational services for children with special needs be obtained. This permission was obtained in both Brandenburg and Bavaria.

Finally, all of the ethical considerations to be taken into account to protect the dignity, privacy, and overall welfare of the participants (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992) were outlined in a letter to the parents of all of the participants. The issues of anonymity, assurance of physical and psychological safety, and of voluntary participation and the right to withdraw at any time were clearly documented. Written and informed consent was then obtained from the parents and participants prior to the initiation of the study.

## Selection of Participants

A purposeful sample (Merriam, 1988) of four students was selected; one student from each of the settings of Alberta, Quebec, Bavaria, and Brandenburg. The goal was to learn about their experiences in elementary school and gain an understanding of how or whether inclusionary practices, as per the goals of the Salamanca Declaration, were being met in educational settings in each of the provinces/states.

Students were selected with the support and help of the school teachers and principals, according to: (a) identification as having attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (identified through a medical or psychological assessment), (b) being 12 years old at the time of the interviews and in the sixth grade at school, and (c) students' ability to participate according to their willingness and desire to commit time to be interviewed, their ability to express themselves verbally, and their willingness to share their experiences.

The Interview Process

This type of interview requires the researcher to have no presuppositions about what will be learned. The researcher needs to maintain a high degree of flexibility to be able to pursue information in whatever direction appears to be appropriate. The questions evolve from the immediate context, in the direction which appears to be appropriate (van Manen, 1992). This style of interviewing facilitated the creation of an atmosphere that was respectful and non-intrusive, yet remained close to the lived experience of the participants. Individuals were encouraged to describe their experiences in detail and the open-ended questions allowed them to share stories of their experiences. Each of the participants participated in a series of four interviews, each one approximately 45 minutes in length. The number of interviews had not been pre-established. However, saturation of the topic was reached by the fourth interview with all of the students. All of the interviews were conducted in a quiet room in the school that the participant attended. The interviews were tape-recorded and subsequent to each interview the conversation was transcribed into a narrative analysis (Polkinghorne, 1995). A summary of the previous interview and each of the meaning units (see data

analysis section, Kvale 1996) was shared with the participant at the beginning of the next interview, to ensure that an accurate account had been made of the student's experiences. It was generally the starting point of the subsequent interview, whereby a topic, or story was the trigger for the beginning of the conversation. In addition, field notes were kept of all observations, which included the researcher's insights and interpretations.

Data Analysis

The procedural steps utilized to analyze the data are described in the following paragraph. The initial concern of the researcher had been that there existed a possibility for misinterpretation of information shared by the students in Germany--in Bavaria, and Brandenburg--as all interviews were conducted in German by the researcher and students. The researcher had passed the university requirements for the German language. However she recognized that as she had only acquired the language a short time before, she was especially concerned about the possibility of misinterpretation of some comments made by the students in German. Hence, in order to ensure credibility, precautions were taken with students in Canada and Germany as described below.

Each interview of the participant's verbal reports recorded on cassette tape was transcribed verbatim, and the transcript was read several times to gain a sense of the overall interview. Following that, the following process was undertaken:

1. Significant phrases or sentences relevant to the research question were extracted from the transcripts by highlighting them.

2. Each significant statement was examined to formulate its meaning and each "meaning unit" was recorded on a separate index card. As described by Kvale (1996), a

meaning unit is a summary of the participant's original statement and the researcher's understanding of that statement within the context of the entire transcript.

3. The above steps were followed after each interview with a child, and comments on a subsequent interview which followed a previous "meaning unit" were added to the original statement. In order to compensate for the additional credibility concerns of the German-English translations, the interviews conducted in German were transcribed, and meaning units formulated initially in German. A second researcher-educator, fluent in German and English, who was originally from America but had resided in Bavaria for several years, assisted with the transcribing and subsequent translations. The meaning units were then translated into English, along with links of the transcription to facilitate the flow of the narrative. They were then translated back into German to ensure that the wording of the translation maintained the original meaning as described by the student.

4. The transcription and meaning units were then shared with each student in each setting, prior to the following interview.

5. Following the completion of the interviews, individual interviews were examined and meaning units similar in nature were clustered. Individual accounts were written to represent individuals' perceptions, reflections, and descriptions of their school experiences. A draft which integrated all of the 'meaningful units' was shared with a student one last time to ensure it represented an accurate summary of a student's experiences.

6. The goal of the study was to present a narrative analysis of the experiences of each individual, so that readers could gain an understanding and appreciation of each

student's unique situation. Where commonalities in experiences were found, they were identified and the articulation and interpretation of the phenomenon was presented in the discussion section.

## Findings

The following section includes a narrative analysis of the experiences of the four participants based on an analysis of the transcripts as described above. Each individual account begins with a general description of the educational setting where the student attended school, followed by a description of the student's educational experiences, so that the reader may develop a picture of the child within his ecological environment. Excerpts of the individual accounts have been written in a narrative format in order to capture the essence of the interviews and the participants' original descriptions. Students selected pseudo-names for their narratives, in order that their confidentiality may be protected.

### Ian from Alberta

Ian was a 12 year old student in grade six, with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder who had been classified as having a behavior disorder, according to the Alberta Education designation system. The previous year when he was in grade five, Ian told me that things went "from bad to REAL bad" at school, and that following some meetings which his mother attended, but to which he was not allowed to go, he had to switch schools. Previously he attended a school close to his home, but the one which he attended at the time of the interviews required a 20 minute ride on a special school bus.

Ian attended a regular elementary school for children from kindergarten through grade six. The school housed a special classroom for children with identified externalizing behavior difficulties. Midway through grade six just prior to being interviewed, Ian had graduated from the specialized setting, and was eligible for full integration in the regular class setting. However, he still spent a portion of each day in the specialized setting. Ian's explanation of this was that "...sometimes I need to have somewhere to go and think, and I can't think upstairs." (the regular classroom). Ian additionally justified his need for a specialized setting as he went through this transition phase, due to the instability of his relationships with his peers in that, "...sometimes too when the other kids are bugging me I just walk out on'em, and go downstairs. That way they don't get punched, 'cause if I didn't (walk out) I'd get em back for buggin'me!! Nobody bugs me down there, they leave me alone. Even what's her name (the special education teacher) just lets me be, and then I can think. I usually go back after lunch" (to the regular class).

Despite documenting that he had had difficulties at various times throughout his school career, and that his peers had frequently taunted him, Ian consistently maintained that his experience of school had been "good". He justified this stating that, "I've learned a lot, and I've got to you know, because I need to finish school in order to get a job, and make a living". He recounted the importance of this during each interview, and provided examples of family members and friends whom he was hoping to model after. When Ian reflected further about his earlier experiences of school, he spoke not only about getting in fights when other students taunted him, but as well about a need to be in control, or perhaps have a sense of control. "At my other school you know, I used to

run the class. I even got my last teacher over there scared of me, I'd tell her that I wasn't taking home any homework. It was stupid; and she actually listened to me, and didn't make me do it! (chuckle)... Yeah, I guess if they didn't give me attention, they ignored me a lot you see, then I made them give me attention....Yeah they were all women". Ian's stature, and unassuming manner didn't seem to fit with this picture, although previous school records documented the inappropriate behaviors. Ian noted however that he was not allowed to get away with this type of behavior at home, as, "My mom though, no, boy I can't control her. She MAKES me listen to her."

Ian additionally noted that things differed in his new school, as structure and discipline were consistent across educational settings. As he described, "At this school though boy, it's different. Even my teacher downstairs, she's a woman, but boy, you don't go trying to control her! She's actually really nice though, as long as you don't do anything stupid....My teacher upstairs, well he is pretty neat. I sorta' get to do what I want. He lets me move around, but nobody really gets away with anything even though at first I thought you could because it always looks kind of messy in there."

Ian reiterated strongly that he felt that teachers have been the important factor in determining if he felt positive about school, and about his own abilities. He reflected that " My grade two teacher, she was the best teacher that I ever had. ... You know, she really believed in me and she used to give us all little treats if we did good work. I still have a funny pencil she gave me once." He reflected briefly over his reasons for rating her as his best teacher and explained that, "She never got mad when I screwed up; the others, they all yelled". Ian went on to describe his loyalty to his teacher, in that,"... You

know for her (the grade two teacher), I tried not to mess up, 'cause I wanted to be good. I couldn't help it though."

Concentrating and sitting quietly had apparently been areas of difficulty for Ian for a long time. He explained that he doesn't mean to act inappropriately, that it has always been difficult for him to sit quietly and concentrate. He apparently had been diagnosed latently as having attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). As he described, "now they tell me it's because I have this attention deficit thing. I don't know, I just can't sit still, and when anyone bugs me, I HAVE to get 'em back..."

When Ian was asked what he would suggest to teachers in order to become more effective in their teaching, Ian had no difficulty in providing several suggestions about classroom management, pupil-teacher relationships, as well as how and what to teach. "I could tell them how to be a good teacher for ALL kinds of kids. They need to be strict, real strict, and not try to be your buddy. But they need to take an interest in us, like ask us what are hobbies are, and what we did on the weekend." He paused briefly here and then added more reflections. "They're allowed to tell us what they do too; they should laugh, and play games with us, and play or come outside--at least sometimes, ... and talk at lunch hour recess." He talked about the importance of making the teaching topics interesting, and lessons motivating. As Ian stated, "They need to teach us stuff in different ways, not stuff just out of the book either. When teachers do that I get bored, then I get in trouble."

Ian initiated using the term "integration", when he talked about coming to a school with a specialized setting that was far from his home and neighborhood friends. He mentioned pros and cons about attending a school with special services, and decided

that he was glad he had been transferred there when he was. However, he decided that, "Integration is really important for me, I wouldn't want to be stuck downstairs forever (the special class setting); it would get boring. But when I have a bad day ...like this morning was...(sigh), then I'm glad I can go there. Some days are harder than others. I guess I think that every school should be like this one--where there's a place you can go when things aren't going that good, but you shouldn't have to go there all the time unless you're real bad."

Ian voluntarily initiated on more than one occasion his concerns about the upcoming year, when he would start junior high school. "Last year taught me a lot. It's hard sometimes though and the other kids still bug me a lot, but this school's a lot better than the other one. But I'm scared about next year." Whether or not he would be ready for a fully integrated setting was in limbo, and it appeared as though he was uncertain of this decision as well.

What could be observed was that he was becoming increasingly aware of how his own behavior could get out of control, and how other students viewed this. He was learning to monitor and maintain his behaviors under self-control, which was a positive step towards successful inclusion at a junior high level. He was also beginning to be able to look ahead and note the long-term ramifications of his actions. Ian was beginning to formulate some values and goals to achieve to feel successful. With the belief and intent that he would find a job and one day retire, he reflected upon and summarized the strategy he intends to achieve success. "You know when I get old and have grandkids, I'm going to tell them that they gotta listen, and work hard, 'cause

someday you're gonna have to go to university and then get a job--that's what I'm trying to do now too".

Jean from Quebec

Jean attended a regular English speaking school in Quebec, approximately three km. from his home. A school bus picked him up every morning at his door, and dropped him off after school. It was Jean's last year at this school which he had attended since pre-kindergarten, as he would enter junior high school in a new setting the following year. Quebec's legislation, frequently termed 'mandated', since 1992 has advocated that inclusion is to be the preferred educational model for all children, and that children are to be eligible to receive appropriate educational services in their neighborhood school. Hence, all special services--such as remedial help, behavior support, or speech therapy would be provided to children in their school. Only those students who had significant special needs--on a short- or long-term basis received consideration for schooling in a special setting with the goal of inclusion as early as possible.

Jean attended a regular grade six class and participated in all subjects with his age-appropriate peers. Three times a week he visited a special classroom in the school for resource help in language arts, study skills, and organization. A few other students from his class and the grade five class attended too, so that a total of five students received help in the small group for 45 minutes at a time. According to Jean's principal, he had at various times been the little 'hell's angel' of the school, and a special setting which would have meant a school on-site at the psychiatric hospital had been considered at one point. However, it was noted that he had calmed down over the last few years.

Jean described school as generally "good", and felt his first year of school in kindergarten was the best year that he could recall. "Kindergarten was good you know, the way school should always be I think, at least elementary school." He credited his teacher for facilitating his positive experiences, and provided examples which illustrated elements of an effective teaching style, classroom management techniques, and a caring teacher-student relationship, which together described an effective teacher. He described her key teaching attributes as, "...well I think she was strict especially for kindergarten and she made you sort of do almost real work. But you know, .she never yelled at you even when you did something really BAD!! You know, you learned in her class". Her relationship with students was illustrated by the comment that, "She remembers everybody, even all the guys that go away and then come back and visit". Jean tried to describe what distinguished her as being a special teacher for him. "I don't know--She believed in me and everybody, and when you messed up, she didn't have fits like some of the others do." He offered feedback for these teachers hoping they would be able to think of him as a good person and that he didn't deliberately act defiantly. "Teachers gotta understand that kids aren't bad on purpose--most of us anyhow."

Jean had further suggestions for teachers to be more effective in their role of teaching and managing a class. He felt that "they can't be scared to be strict and have rules or else kids will drive them nuts, trying to take control." To improve their relationship with students, he suggested that, "Teachers need to know the names of all of the kids, and at least show a bit of interest in what the kids do. Teachers need to be enthusiastic, like kids, and like teaching kids....It shows when they don't." He had comments about teaching methods and teachers' perceptions regarding performance

expectations, and suggested that, "You know, when they change themes, and do other stuff than just what is in the book it's a lot more interesting." Jean had concerns about working in group formations when students were given tasks to be accomplished individually. He felt that, "They should only put us in groups if they want us to do group work. When they put us in groups but then yell because we are making too much noise, I don't understand it. What do they expect?" As children with ADHD frequently have difficulty concentrating, and completing tasks (Kronenberger & Meyer, 1996), it is possible that Jean found it very difficult to accomplish tasks in this type of a situation.

Jean had very strong feelings about attending school in an inclusive setting. He stated that, "I want to be just like all of the other kids!". Jean reiterated a few times that he liked school, "Most of the time, except when I've been really bad, and I have to spend the whole day in the office". He didn't offer to describe any of the 'real bad' incidents, but instead focussed on positive outcomes of appropriate behavior. " ...I haven't BEEN REAL BAD for a while, ' guess the stupid medication helps; the kids aren't bugging me as much right now. My teacher actually likes me I think. 'Guess she's not bad--.so--school's okay right now."

Jean, his teacher, and his principal all commented on Jean's recent improvement in behavior. He seemed to have recently stabilized emotionally as he had previously demonstrated very inconsistent academic and behavior performances. His improvement in behavior seemed to have positive ramifications towards improved academic performance and increased peer acceptance. Hopes for continued emotional stability were verbalized, particularly as Jean would graduate from elementary school that year, and enter a large junior high school in September. Concern had been expressed by his

teacher about the fact that he would lose the personalized environment that he had been a part of so far. Thus it was hoped that he would continue to develop increased self-reliance in order to be able to succeed in the larger setting.

Michel from Brandenberg

Michel attended a segregated school for children with behavior disorders in Potsdam, a suburb of Berlin. The school was constructed from two older row houses side by side, facing a busy street in Potsdam. One side of the school housed offices, including the school director's, who had been director since 1981-well before the reunification. In the other half of the school, classrooms, a lunchroom, and small playroom utilized all of the available space. The school housed small classes of up to eight children with severe behavior disorders from kindergarten to grade seven. Children were divided according to their age and grade level in the various classes, although some of the classes had split grades, such as a grade four-five due to lesser numbers of children in those grades. Apparently the school was filled to capacity, and there was a list of students waiting for an available space. Recess took place outside at the rear of the houses, in the paved back-yard. Unfortunately there was not much space or equipment to enable the children to be active. As the children all had recess at the same time, maintaining order as they went outside, and came back in, was a challenge for the teachers.

Located on a busy street amidst a series of decrepit row-houses, the school initially was not recognizable. The physical appearance and location of the school provided a reminder of the stark physical and social changes that are taking place in Brandenburg. For although the ideology and goals of the ministry of education in

Brandenburg are to include all children, and policies are being developed with that focus, it will be a while before financial and social support is available to appropriately support the inclusion of all children (Goetze, personal communication, 1997). Once inside the school however, the atmosphere changed, and an openness, and yet sense of community could be perceived.

Michel was not very enthusiastic about school, and stated very clearly that it was "boring most of the time." He was able to establish long-term goals for himself however, and justify the need to attend school as he stated, "I need to go to school though or else I won't be able to get a job". As Michel described his impressions of his school experiences, reasons for his lack of enthusiasm became apparent. "At least this school is better than my old one. At my old one, the teachers yelled all of the time, and the kids were really mean. Here they don't yell as much, and they are actually interested in you." He said this with some surprise, as if one expected teachers not to be interested in the lives of their students. Michel later expanded upon his reasons for his strong dislike of his previous school. "At my old school, the others bugged me all of the time. I hated it. There was no where to go except to quit, but if you do that, you don't go anywhere but the street."

According to his school director, until grade Michel had attended a regular school until grade five, but due to the shortage of teacher support he had never received any academic or behavioral support in the regular setting (Heivepriem, personal communication, 1997). Although he had been identified as being 'Hyperactif' from a medical evaluation, he had not presented behavioral difficulties until grade four. He apparently reached a crisis situation then when placed in a very traditionally-run

classroom, with a teacher who had taught school since well before the reunification (Heivepriem). Apparently she was intolerant to the symptoms of his disorder, and had identified him almost immediately as having a behavior disorder, and he had become the class scapegoat. The school director described the situation briefly, stating that the situation had gotten out of control quickly. Michel had been ostracized by his teacher, which resulted in alienation and ridicule by his peers. He had reacted with outbursts of out-of-control behavior. Michel had entered the special setting with a very negative attitude. However, with the small teacher-to-student ratio (6:1 or 7:1) and intolerance for any ridicule or taunting he had regained his self-esteem, calmed down, and this year in grade six, was displaying a constructive attitude (Heivepriem).

There were no transportation services for the children, which caused difficulty at times for students who lived a distance away. Most of the children took the regular bus, but due to poor connections some children had an hour-and-a-half bus ride to and from school. This seemed to be an issue for Michel, as he described the situation on two discrete occasions stating that; "I just hate getting the bus now because it takes so long to get to school. I'm scared that I'll be late and I don't want any punishments now. I'm trying to be good so I can get out of here for the next year."

From the comments of the school director, and observations of Michel in a class setting, his intent to achieve was obvious. Although the ratio of students to a teacher was small, the intensity of the needs of each of the students was extremely demanding for one teacher to handle. Due to the diversity of academic levels students worked the majority of the time on an individual basis on academic tasks. While some students appeared to give up easily, and get off task quickly, Michel was observed to be making

efforts to stay on-task even when there were distractions to complete his work. He stated emphatically that, " If I ever have grandkids, I'm not sure what I'd tell them about school...I guess that they better work hard, because if you don't work hard you pay for it." Michel's explanation for this comment was that, " You see there are hardly any jobs, and if you're not good, then you don't get a job. If you don't get a job, you will have lots of problems. But--I will be good, and I will get a job." Michel then appeared to get sidetracked, and commented that, "By then maybe they'll get rid of some of our old teachers." He then followed up with, "Then I could get their job, and become a teacher".

Michel tended to speak mostly about the situation at his present special school and his future goals, rather than his former school. He did state that, "Teachers and the other kids can drive you crazy, but the teacher shouldn't let that happen". Michel didn't go into detail or provide a reference to a specific situation that provoked the intensity of that comment, however it was perceived that he was making reference to his experiences at his previous school. His present school director, who had observed him on several occasions in the previous setting had described him as being a little insect or animal, on whom all of the vultures (the other students) stalked and pounced for their prey. Michel still carried with him resentment about his experiences though, which he verbalized at times by placing the blame on his teachers. An example of this resentment was illustrated when he lashed out that, "They don't know how to teach! Teachers have to be strict, but they also have to care about what they do a bit!". He acknowledged that, "I like school when a teacher likes us. I like the new teachers that I have. The old ones though, they didn't care about us, they thought we were delinquents!" Michel didn't

seem to have a favorite or meaningful teacher who stood out for him though. Although the school director had said that it was only the last year of his enrollment in a regular school which was a problem, it seemed as though from Michel's reactions and generalized comments that his early years of school were difficult as well.

The theme of integration or inclusion was never initiated with the students directly. Students discussed factors which they had been exposed to which affected their experiences of school. Michel's experiences in a regular school presented an example of negative ramifications which could have evolved from a lack of training and support for classroom teachers who worked in the field for several years and were never exposed to working with children with special needs.

Wolfgang from Bavaria

When he entered grade five the previous year, Wolfgang, along with the other grade five students from his previous special school, entered a 'Hauptschule' in Munich, Bavaria. In Bavaria, students are "streamed" after grade four. Those students who have received high grades, and will likely continue on to university go into a 'Gymnasium' School setting in grade five. Students less-academically inclined, but who are motivated about school enter a 'Realeschule'. Realeschules are geared towards students who would likely aspire to go to college rather than university. Vocational education training is a component of these schools. Children who have demonstrated poor marks, or attitudes, as well as children who attended a special school from grades one to four (e.g. children with behavior disorders) enter a 'Hauptschule'. Hauptschules are vocationally oriented, and house students with a wide diversity of needs, whose only commonality may be low academic results. Hence students who in grade four exhibit

behavior disorders, have mild mental handicapping conditions, to whom German is a second language, or potentially simply have a lack of motivation or ability for academics, are all potential candidates to attend a Hauptschule.

Wolfgang was a part of a class of approximately 20 students. The classroom was set up in a structured manner with the students in rows, facing the teacher who directed the lessons. The students appeared to be challenging to control and keep on task for any period of time. The students' day went from eight in the morning until one in the afternoon. They were finished for the day then, but most students stayed for lunch and hung around afterwards. One teacher in particular could be observed spending informal time with students, as he ran gym activities some afternoons and ate lunch with them sometimes.

Wolfgang described his earliest memories of Germany and school in a negative manner, explaining that, "When I first started grade one, my family had just moved here from Turkey, to see some of my relatives who had lived in Germany for a long, long time. My folks decided to stay here, though why, I don't know. When I first started school I didn't know any German. I remember a boy who I thought was swearing at me. He probably was only calling 'hey kid', but I didn't know. I had really wanted to go to school, but I was really scared too. I thought he was making fun of me because the kids close to my apartment all did. So I hit him. The next day they sent me to another school. I went there until the end of grade four. It was a special school for kids who are bad and lots of kids there get into lots of trouble. Nobody bugged me there though. Even when I couldn't sit still they didn't yell like they do here."

Wolfgang indicated a strong desire to be in a different setting than he presently attended, "because the kids are really loud and rowdy and the teachers usually just ignore them." He was aware of his medical diagnosis of ADHD or as it is called in Germany, "Hyperactivity" and that it was the underlying reason for his difficulties in concentrating. He explained his difficulty in a straight-forward way, as he stated, "I am 'hyperactive' you see. My doctor told me that that is why I cannot concentrate and I have to take pills to help me sit better." He reflected further about his learning difficulties, questioning the appropriateness of the school placement, "I don't know why I still have to go here though, because I am not as hyperactive as I used to be, and I'm not able to concentrate in our classroom, with so many students and the noise level". Wolfgang's actions still indicated an inability to sit and focus for any period of time, so it could be perceived how he might encounter difficulties in this type of a setting where there were many students and frequent distractions.

Wolfgang had a definite affinity for his previous school where he felt he had belonged. It seemed as though he felt somewhat lost here in the large 'Hauptschule'. Yet, he spoke highly of one teacher at his present school with whom he felt comfortable. "Our old school was better, 'cause I think the teachers actually cared about us a bit. My class three teacher used to help me with my German a bit and she showed me how to kick a ball in soccer--she's really good. We actually have one good teacher now. He teaches us Physical Education. He is really strict when he teaches us, but you have to be to be a good teacher. But he helps us and spends time with us. You can tell that he cares about the kids, even the ones who don't come to school any more, but just drop in".

Wolfgang subsequently explained why he resented coming to the Hauptschule so much. He had very focused goals and wanted to complete school and obtain employment. He felt that in a school such as this where there were fairly large and boisterous classes he had a harder time concentrating and thus learning the subject matter. "I know that I have to work really hard though so that I can get a job when I finish school. I want to get a good job and earn lots of money. It's hard though, because I have this condition, so that I have a hard time concentrating. But if I ever have kids, I'm going to tell them--yes grandkids too, to work really hard in school. It's really important so that you can get a job after".

Wolfgang's difficulties in concentration were apparent, even in a one-to-one situation, as he was easily distracted and had difficulty maintaining a conversation on any topic or completing his descriptions of a situation or theme. He seemed to have endless positive unused energy, as he moved constantly, and fidgeted with small objects or his with his fingers. He spoke emphatically about achieving his goals, and had a positive orientation about life in general. This contrasted sharply to the majority of students here, whom did not appear to be motivated about school and spoke sharply of their disillusionment with education and society. However, due to Wolfgang's academic weaknesses and ADHD, this was the designated educational setting for him to attend.

## Discussion and Reflections About the ~~Students'~~ Perceptions of ~~their~~ Experiences

Each of the narratives presented tells a unique story about a student's experiences in elementary school. The students had been matched as closely as possible in characteristics according to age, school grade, and diagnosis of attention deficit

hyperactivity disorder, in order to give credibility to the study, and facilitate an analysis of the common trends, and differences between their experiences.

Differing Environments

Although the students all had been assessed as having attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, the type of educational setting which they attended contrasted sharply between children. From a totally integrated setting in Quebec, through to a totally separate setting in Bavaria, school environments appeared to be a direct reflection of the educational policies of the province or state (Lister-Bauer, 1998). For example, the Ministry of Education in Quebec favors integration of children with special needs. It is strongly suggested that children should attend their neighborhood school, and be a part of the regular class with their age-group peers. Special funding is provided at board level, for special support for children who have been designated as having a special need. However it is determined at board level how to best make use of the funding, whether through support personnel, adaptive equipment, or specialized training of teachers, and so on. In Bavaria alternatively, children who have a mental handicapping condition or behavior disorder do not have the right to attend a regular school. It is perceived that it is in the students'best interests to attend a special school (Lister-Bauer, 1998).

Justification to Attend School and Get a Job

Three out of the four students had formulated long–term goals about their future, and were able to justify enduring the frustrations of their daily school experiences as the means to be able to gain worthwhile employment, and live a successful life. Ian from

Alberta, Michel from Brandenburg, and Wolfgang from Bavaria each stated on more than one occasion the importance of working hard in school, in order to be able to get employment afterwards. Their teachers and/or principals noted and reflected upon these recent changes in the students' attitudes and performance. It was noted that they seemed to be motivated by a long-term goal to try even when they encountered a difficult task, as compared to previously when their efforts were very inconsitant. The goal to 'succeed in life' seemed to be the influencing factor in motivating the students to work to their capacity, despite the difficulties they encountered in learning, or with other distractions.

Alternatively, Jean, from Quebec still seemed to focus on short-term goals, as his decisions were based relative to the recent past, and near future. A big step for him had been to perceive himself relative to his peers, and how they viewed his actions. Now it was important for him to feel like he was a part of the norm, and to have his peers' acceptance. Thus although Jean was the same age, and in the same grade as the other three students, he still perceived the world through his direct experiences, and could not hypothesize future implications events which were taking place presently.

Need for Effective Teachers to "Believe In" Each Student

The key factor expressed by all four students was the need to feel valued, and to be a part of the classroom community. Each of them felt that a teacher was the catalyzer as to whether they would be included or not. Ian (Alberta) and Jean (Quebec) were both able to recall about a teacher who had been special for them, and as they said, those were the teachers that "believed in" them. Michel (Brandenburg) noted how important

it is to be believed in, and spoke about not being included. He spoke positively about the teachers in his new school, and how they seemed to care. Wolfgang spoke about missing the feeling of 'being cared about', which he had felt in his previous school.

The need to feel included has been documented extensively ( Briggs, 1987; Burns, Roe, & Ross, 1984), and as Briggs (1987) suggested, teachers can establish a warm accepting class environment, facilitating feelings of security, self-esteem, and acceptance on the part of the child (p. 205). Hence, potentially increased awareness and emphasis should be placed on the significance of teachers' attitudes, and how they may positively influence children's motivation to try, and attempt new learning tasks.

The students described effective teachers according to their type of personality, and classroom management style. They suggested that effective teachers motivate students by being enthusiastic themselves, by displaying an enthusiasm for learning, a willingness to share, and listen to children's ideas and concerns. Two students mentioned that the utilization of a diversity of teaching methods helped maintain interest in the subject matter.

Effective classroom management was noted by all of the students to be extremely important. All four students said that teachers need to be "strict', but maintain control in a positive constructive manner, by "being nice" and "not yelling." Two students noted that influential teachers believed in their students unconditionally--as they described that they understood that when they acted inappropriately, their teacher knew it was not with prior intent and "that kids aren't bad on purpose", as Jean had noted.

Wish to Minimize Peer Rejection and Ridicule

All four of the students described feelings of frustration regarding their relationships with peers. They had all been teased and alienated to varying degrees throughout their school experiences. Michel potentially had been the one affected the most, before he had transferred schools, and he tended to place blame on the teacher for her lack of control and lack of understanding his special needs. Alternatively, Ian and Jean were learning to see themselves relative to their peers, and were starting to self-monitor their own behaviors, based on their peers reactions. Wolfgang appeared to perceive a situation from an egocentric perspective, without realizing the impact of his distractions on them.

Unfortunately, due to a lack of appropriate supports, Michel had experienced physical integration rather than social or true integration with his non-handicapped peers. A special setting then became a secure environment, away from the taunts and hurt. Ian, who had experienced difficulty with peer relationships in a regular setting, had an opportunity to be in a special class, a safe environment, to learn and practice appropriate social behaviors. When he was ready, he was able to experience inclusion at his own pace, by spending short sessions in a regular classroom, always with the quiet special setting to return to as needed, as he learned to be better able to develop self-control, and monitor his behavior. These two situations illustrate the need for effective supports to facilitate successful inclusion of students, based upon their individual readiness, and the readiness of the receiving environment to include them as a valued part of the group. Alternatively, if there is not adequate planning and support, physical

inclusion may only take place, potentially resulting in negative experiences for all individuals involved.

In summary, regardless of the culture or type of educational setting, these four students with attention deficit attention disorder perceived that a teacher was the most important factor in determining for them how they felt about school and their own abilities. The effects of negative peer interactions was determined to be a factor in determining how a student felt about a regular setting; however deemed to be more important was how a teacher treated each student in his/her classroom. Effective classroom control, and a motivated, enthusiastic caring teacher was seen to be the catalyst for students to feel positive about their school experiences, their own abilities, and develop feelings of belonging to the class community.

Inclusion and 'Being Included'

The four students with special needs spoke about their experiences of school, and of the importance of 'being included' as an important member of the classroom community. The Salamanca Declaration on Inclusion (UNESCO, 1994), documented that schools are actually a reflection of society, and that regular schools with an inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, and achieving education for all...(UNESCO, para.2).

It has been stated that one of the most difficult tasks facing teachers today is to provide all children with opportunities to achieve to their potentials (Jenkinson, 1997). It has been suggested that rather than evaluate programs according to whether children are physically included or not, a more comprehensive way would be to evaluate students' progress in all areas of learning (social/emotional as well as skill based)

(Andrews & Lupart, 1993). According to the narratives of the four students presented here, physical inclusion is not an appropriate measure to utilize when evaluating the extent of inclusive programming.

The inclusive school movement represents a distinct perspective on how schools might respond to the diverse learning needs of their students. Orientations about inclusion have included a rights or ethics oriented perspective, whereby arguments for inclusion were based on perspectives of human rights, or more generalized perceptions of social justice and equality (Lipsky & Gartner, 1996: Skrtic, 1991). Alternatively, a more pragmatic approach would suggest that it is through schools and classrooms, with the utilization of a child-centered pedagogy that inclusion will be validated. It is perceived then that a key determining factor towards successful inclusion is in how schools are organized, supports available, and information provided on the specific learning needs of each students with special needs, actual classroom practice, and how administrators can empower their staff to be more inclusive in their approach.

The nature of the experiences of the students from Alberta, Quebec, Bavaria, and Brandenburg lend support to the hypothesis that classroom practice, and teachers' orientation towards inclusion will be key factors in determining the degree of success of inclusion practices. These students' experiences provided significant documentation about the impact of teachers' actions and values towards children with special needs upon the success or failure of their inclusion. Potentially, empowerment of teachers may in turn facilitate empowerment of students, as teachers gain increased confidence in their abilities to meet the needs of students with varied abilities (Fraser, 1998). Presently, the experiences of Ian in Alberta, and Jean in Quebec, suggest that these

provinces are taking an inclusive approach towards the education of students with special needs, with the goal being to facilitate holistic learning for all students. In Brandenburg, the goal is to provide an inclusive learning environment for all children. However, more time and funding is still needed to rebuild the physical, then social structure of the society. In Bavaria, the educational philosophies, and resultant policies are not (yet) inclusive in nature regarding some individuals with special needs.. Hence, for a child such as Wolfgang, who is motivated to achieve, but who needs personal empowerment and support to do so, the educational system in Bavaria is actually detrimental in assisting to reach his learning potential. Therefore, from both a human rights and a pragmatic perspective, Bavaria's present educational policies regarding some groups of children with special needs are in some situations, in conflict with an inclusive approach. A child like Wolfgang will only ultimately succeed when he has a clear direction and mind-set towards the achievement of his goals and when he is able to persevere despite challenges against him.

## Summary

In summary, the experiences of these four children enable us to view inclusion as a process--in which there are many complexities and compromises that must be taken into account when 'inclusion' is perceived to be the ultimate goal of education. We come to see that the analysis of inclusion is multi-dimensional in nature and that we cannot simply evaluate a situation as being inclusive, or not inclusive. Rather, we can evaluate a situation as being more or less inclusive, in one or more respects. When it really comes down to it, true inclusion, as validated by four at-risk students, really

means including and accepting each individual as a valid member of a classroom community, so that each feels he is 'being included'.

It is hoped that educators, researchers, and administrators will not forget what the real and valid purpose of inclusion is, and why it has evolved to be the preferred educational setting for all children. If inclusion is implemented in a truly realistic manner, appropriate training and supports must be available as needed. Then, and only then is it appropriate to believe that the inclusive experience will facilitate for all children the affective goal of "being included" as a valuable member of their classroom and learning community.

## References

Ainscow, M .(1994). Special needs in the classroom: A teacher education guide. UNESCO.

Alberta Education, (1991). Meeting the individual needs of Alberta students: A framework for positive change. Alberta: Minister of Education.

Booth, T. (1995). Mapping inclusion and exclusion: concepts for all? In C. Clark, A. Dyson & A. Millward. Towards inclusive schools. London: David Fulton.

Briggs, L. (1987). A Poor attitude: A Deterrent to reading improvement. Reading Horizens, Spring, 1987, 202-208.

Canadian Charter of Rights & Freedoms, 1982. (1986). In M. Manley-Casimir & Sussel. (Eds.) Courts in the classroom: Education and the Charter of Rights, (pp.237-245). Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

Canadian School Executive, (1985). Mainstreaming: Legal obligations for administrators. The Canadian School Executive Newsletter, February, 1985, 3-5.

Carroll, T. (1992). The role of anthropologists in the restructuring of schools. In G. Hess (Ed.). Empowering teachers and parents: School restructuring through the eyes of anthropologists. (pp. 47-62). Conneticut: Bergin & Harvey.

Creswell, J. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Dahl, K. (1995). Challenges in understanding the learner's perspective. Theory into Practice, Vol. 34, 2, 124-130.

Davies, D. (1993). Looking backward. In S. Thompson (Ed.). Whole child, whole community. ( pp. 67-72). Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Delpit, L. (1988). The Silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. Harvard Educational Review, 58, 280-298.

Denzin, N. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.).Handbook of qualitative research. (pp.500-515). Thousand Oaks, CA: sage Publications.

Deutschen Bildungsrat. (1974). Empfehlungen der Bildungskommission- Zur paedagogischen forderung behinderter und von behinderung bedrohter Kinder und Jugendlicher 1973. Zeitschrift fur heilpaedagogik, beiheft, 11, 1-11.

Erikson F., & Shultz, J. (1992). Students' experience of the curriculum. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.). Handbook of research on curriculum (pp. 465-485). New York: MacMillan.

Fraser, H. (1998) Early intervention: Key issues from research. Interchange, 50, 1-12.

Gerber, M. (1995). Inclusion at the high water mark? Some thoughts on Zigmond and Baker's case studies of inclusive educational programs. Journal of Special Education, 29, 2, 181-191.

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers: an introduction. White Plains, New York: Longman Publications.

Goetze, Prof. Dr. H. Professor, University of Postdam, Brandenburg. Personal communication, September 22, 1997.

Gold, A., Bowe, R., & Ball, S. (1993). Special educational needs in a new context: Micropolitics, money, & 'education for all'. In R. Slee (Ed.). Is there a desk with my name on it? The politics of integration. London: Falmer Press.

Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. (pp.105-117). In N. Dezin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). Handbook of qualitative research. (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Heivepriem, Herr W., School Director, Potsdam, Brandenburg. December 5, 1997.,

Jenkinson, J. (1997). Mainstream or special? Educating students with disabilities. London: Routledge.

Janesick, V. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design: metaphor, methodology, and meaning. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln. (Eds.). Handbook of qualitative research, (pp.209- 219). Thousand Oaks,CA: SAGE Publications.

Kvale, S. (1996). Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing. Newbury, C.A.: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y. (1995). In search of students' voices. Theory into Practice, Spring, 1995, 88-93.

Lincoln, Y. (1993). I and thou: Method, voice and roles in research with the silenced. In D. Mclaughlin & W. Tierney (Eds.) Naming silenced lives. (pp.9-28). New York: Routledge.

Lister-Bauer, S. (1998). Towards progressive inclusion and acceptance; A comparison of the trends toward inclusion in Canada and Germany. International Journal of Special Education, 13, 1, 84-101.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco, C.A.: Jossey- Bass. Inc.

Morse, J. (1994). Designing funded research. In N. Denzin & Y Lincoln, (Eds.).Handbook of qualitative research. ( pp. 220-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Oldfather, P. (1995). " Songs come back to them": Students' experiences as researchers. Theory into Practice, Vol. 34, 2, 131-137.

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation & research methods. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Polkinghorne, D.E.(1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. In J. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.). Life history and narrative. (pp. 5- 24). Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Powers, L., Singer, G., & Todis, B. (1996). Reflections on competence: Perspectives of successful adults. In L. Powers, G. Singer, & J. Sowers (Eds.). On the way to autonomy: Promoting self competence in children & youth with disabilities. ( pp.237-254). Baltimore, M.D: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Company.

Schaar, A. (1997), Minister of Education, Bavaria, personal communication, January 23, 1997.

Siegler, R. (1991). Children's thinking. (2nd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Skrtic, T. (1991). Behind special education, a critical analysis of professional culture and school organization. Colorado: Love Publishing Company.

Slee, R. (1996). Disability, class & poverty: School structures and policing identities. In C. Christensen & F. Rizvi. (Eds.). Disability and the dilemmas of education and justice. (pp.86-97). England: Open University Press.

Stangvik, G. (1997). Beyond schooling; Integration in a policy perspective. In S. Pijl, C. Meijer, & S. Hegarty (Eds.). Inclusive education: A global agenda. (pp.66-72). London: Routledge.

UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca statement and framework on special needs education. Paris: UNESCO.

van Manen, M. (1992). Researching the lived experience, Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. London, Ontario: Althouse Press.

Taylor, D. (1993). From the child's point of view. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Vidlich, A. & Lyman, M. (1994). Qualitative methods: Their history in sociology and anthropology. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, (Eds.). Handbook of qualitative research, (pp.23-59). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

# CHAPTER VI

## GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this inquiry was to gain a better understanding of the nature of inclusion from an ecosystems perspective in Canada and Germany. Inclusion was assessed through the impact and interaction of factors at differing levels--from children's experiences at a practice level, through to program interventions, to policies and cultural values.

The educational policies regarding the nature of the services available for children with special needs were assessed from a human rights perspective in each of the four states and provinces in Canada and Germany and compared regarding factors which affected their degree of 'inclusiveness'. Two program intervention models, "Success for All" and "Reading Recovery", designed to support children academically-at-risk in inclusive settings were reviewed and compared. Finally, one child with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and a severe emotional-behavioral designation, from each of the provinces and states, described his perceptions of his experiences of school through a series of open-ended interviews. Each child's story was assessed through a narrative analysis, facilitating an understanding of each unique situation. Common trends were discussed subsequently to the individual narrative stories. An ecosystems framework facilitated an analysis of the many factors which interact--from a macro-level of policies and cultural values, through to a meso-level of program supports and intervention to the micro-level of children's experiences--to determine the actual degree of inclusion taking place.

## An Ecosystems Framework

An ecosystems theoretical model known as the Ecology of Human Development (Brofenbrenner, 1979) provides a framework through which the impacts of various levels of environmental settings on children's experiences may be perceived. According to Brofenbrenner (1979), children's development is dependent upon their ability to perceive and understand their environments, and personal ability to make changes within them. Thus ideally, children from an early age develop a concept of an existence of relationships between people and the impact of their own and others' actions upon these relationships. Brofenbrenner suggested that children need to recognize that they are a part of a dynamic and evolving human and contextual system ( 1979, p.27).

Brofenbrenner utilized the conceptual model to discuss what he perceived to be inequalities of power in society, whereby individual differences such as disability, ethnic identity, and beliefs are seen as deficiencies if they differ from the norm of society. He envisioned an intentional ongoing process of mutual respect, critical reflection, caring, and group participation in which people would be involved in reciprocal relationships in and across all given settings within society (Brofenbrenner, 1979; Dean, 1992).

Today, in North America and Europe, philosophies have been developed, and practices are being sought to effectively include all children in all elements of society and schooling with a view to teaching them to learn to interact effectively with their peers and larger environment, as Brofenbrenner envisioned. This approach has been labelled in various ways over the course of its development, including mainstreaming, integration, and most recently, inclusion. Inclusion within this framework includes more

than a non-biased, culturally sensitive curriculum. Inclusion from an ecosystems perspective seeks to counter balance the societal tendencies to separate, categorize, and culturally differentiate individuals and groups who do not fit into the 'norm' of the dominant group. It also implies meeting the needs of all children within an educational environment, and teaching the value of respect of oneself and others (Brofenbrenner, 1979; UNESCO, 1994).

## The Ideology of Inclusion

Brofenbrenner's (1979) conceptualization of an ecological systems model provides a framework to illustrate how global, national, or provincial level policies and ideologies actually impact upon our daily experiences. Brofenbrenner utilized his model to discuss the potential impact of negative or positive societal values upon individuals. Negative impacts from a lack of awareness or acceptance of individual differences may result in rejection and ridicule of individuals with special needs. Alternatively, by addressing each of the levels of an ecosystem, and focussing on the building of the values of mutual respect, critical reflection, caring, and cooperation, positive societal values could and would be achieved. Hence, an ideology of inclusion could be achieved, which would reflect the values listed above, as Brofenbrener (1979) had conceptualized.

## Relevance of the Salamanca Declaration

In 1994, in Salamanca, Spain, 85 nations ratified their agreement with the Salamanca Declaration (UNESCO, 1994). It proclaimed five principles towards the creation of the rights of all children to have access to regular schools which in turn

should welcome and accommodate them within a child-centered pedagogy. In keeping with Brofenbrenner's recommendations, it was documented that regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society, and achieving education for all (UNESCO, 1994, para. 2 ).

Salamanca Declaration as the Framework of the Ecosystem of Inclusion

It may be perceived that the goals and ideals of the Salamanca Declaration reflect Brofenbrenner's ideology for an inclusive society, however from a school-based perspective. Thus, the Salamanca Declaration may be utilized as a means from which to evaluate the proximity of each of the eco-systems, or provinces/states towards true inclusion. This is based upon a comprehensive picture describing the status of their policies, type of program interventions, and the nature of the experiences of children with special needs. .

Levels of an Inclusive Ecosystems Model from a School-Based Perspective

A Macrosystems Analysis

The ecosystems model described here reflects three tiers of systems. The first outermost level of the ecosystems framework reflects the government policies and cultural ideologies towards the education of children with special needs. The first paper of this thesis provided a description and comparison of the legislation and policies regarding the educational services for children with special needs in each of the four provinces and states; Alberta and Quebec, in Canada, and Bavaria and Brandenburg, in Germany. The status of the policies from each of the four settings was assessed

according to the 10 rights of all children (Making the Most of the Law: Education and the Child with Disabilities, 1993). This paper concluded that although both Canada and Germany have ratified their agreement and commitment towards the ideologies of the Salamanca Declaration, each of the states and provinces is moving towards the achievement of this ideology at its own pace.

Quebec appeared to be moving with greatest speed towards this goal. Policies in Quebec are referred to as mandated, as legislation demands that children are to be provided with an appropriate education in their neighborhood school. It was determined that Alberta's policies were focussed towards the ideology of inclusion as well, although legislation in Alberta is permissive. This terminology indicates that inclusion is the preferred way to go, but a board may determine it is in a child's best interests to attend a special setting, potentially with another school board. Brandenburg has based its legislation and educational ideologies on the Salamanca Declaration and is in the process of developing educational legislations and policies based on a framework of inclusion. It may be a while, however, before practices truly may reflect these ideologies, as time and finances are needed to develop the physical structures, programs, and facilitate awareness and understanding of these ideologies (Lister-Bauer, 1998). Bavaria's policies regarding the education of children with special needs still follow a traditional paradigm whereby it is mandated that some children must receive educational services in segregated settings. Some groups--such as children with sensory impairments or physical impairments--seem to be more accepted than children with behavior disorders or mental handicapping conditions who are not allowed to attend regular schools (Lister-Bauer, 1998).

Analysis of Each of the Mesosystem Levels

The next level of the ecosystem, the mesosystem, reflects upon the orientation of the school situation. It incorporates the interaction of parents and home with the teacher and school community. The collaboration needed at this level in order to be considered inclusive takes time and committed individuals. Some of the elements which need to be included in a program intervention at this level, according to the Salamanca Declaration are: (a) a restructuring of curriculum access and differentiation, (b) criterion referenced assessment relevant to goals of curriculum, (c) partnerships with parents and families (d) the use of group and cooperative learning, and (e) the use of micro-technology, and computer-assisted learning (UNESCO, 1994).

Two program interventions designed to be preventive in nature, and facilitate academic success for all children include "Reading Recovery" and "Success for All". Both of these program interventions are fairly new to Canada, and questions remain regarding the comprehensiveness of their interventions, type of training, supports, and materials provided. As well, their degree of efficacy, and program validity needed to be assessed. The goal of the next two papers was to provide some insights about these program interventions. Success for All was designed as a holistic school-based intervention, that entails restructuring of classes for the language arts intervention, based on ability groupings, individual tutoring, and family support as needed. The Reading Recovery model is more structured, as it focusses on an intensive one-to-one tutoring program to support children-at-risk in grade one. Intensive teacher training and monitoring of children's results helps establish program validity. The effects of the interventions, while effective on a short-term basis, demonstrate conflicting results from

a longitudinal perspective (Fraser, 1998). As well, due to many conflicting factors in a child's life today, it is difficult to actually determine the specific long-term intervention benefits. The efficacy of each of the program elements of the Success for All model is lacking, as was documented in the first of two papers describing the models (Lister Bauer, 1998). In summary, the two models each incorporate--to varying degrees--the components determined to be important for a successful program intervention. More research from researchers outside of the institutes where these models were developed would provide effective and needed analyses to support or refute results obtained by the developers. Research to determine the efficacy of the programs' elements, as well as of the overall programs would be beneficial. However, it cannot really be determined if one model is more inclusive than the other. Success for All and Reading Recovery represent two differing types of program interventions. One is child-based, and one is school-based. The goal of each is similar, however, to provide preventive support to children-at-risk in inclusive settings.

The Microsystem Level

The innermost level of the model is comprised of the microsystem. This level of the model focusses on an individual child's behavior, which can best be understood by considering the context in which it occurs. It is said that there is a reciprocal relationship between the behavior of a child and the immediate environment, as well as the broader social systems. The micro-systems of interest in this inquiry were documented through four students' narratives, regarding their experiences of school. One student from each of the states/provinces (ecosystems) who had attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, was 12 years old, and in grade six, described his experiences of

school through a series of open-ended interviews. A narrative-analysis allowed their stories to be presented individually in order to give a representative picture of the diverse ecosystems. Common themes were then discussed subsequently.

It is perceived that the impact of special settings versus inclusive settings, potentially anticipated as an issue, was not the key factor in determining the efficacy of a setting for students-at-risk. Instead, the teacher's role was perceived as being of prime importance to facilitate success for each of the students. All four students noted that the key to effective learning was an enthusiastic teacher, who maintained control of the class, made lessons interesting, and valued each of the students as an important member of the classroom community. These findings are supported extensively in the literature (e.g. Alexander, 1983; Briggs, 1987), which seems to suggest that an increased emphasis for teacher development and training should be placed upon ensuring that becoming-teachers are comfortable with inclusion, so that they will be able to include children with special needs as members of their classroom community.

Other factors including the taunting and ridicule of peers, lack of transportation access, and distractions in the classroom were perceived as factors that negatively affected the learning of students. Alternatively, students' own motivation to achieve and get a job was sufficient to enable them to cope with the negative factors, and work towards their goals.

## Analysis Within and Between Ecosystems

In addition to drawing comparisons within the same level of systems, the ecosystems should be reviewed for the impact of one system level upon another. In the following section, the impact of the educational policies of the four states/provinces;

Quebec, Alberta, Brandenburg, and Bavaria were reviewed, as described in chapter two, with respect to the experiences of students with ADHD, whose narratives were presented in chapter five. Success for All and Reading Recovery, examples of two program interventions designed to support children-at-risk in inclusive settings were assessed for their potential to support a child in that level of a 'system'.

The Ecosystem of Quebec

Quebec's legislation as was described in chapter two, mandated that educational services be provided for children with special needs in their neighborhood schools and that an inclusive model is the preferred means of service provision for all children.

The narrative of Jean provided a picture in support of the policies and cultural perspectives in Quebec. Jean's narrative highlighted his experiences since kindergarten, and how, despite his unstable behavior, his sense of being a part of the school and community was very strong. Resource support had been available for only for assessments and curriculum modification as needed, along with some direct intervention academic support. Jean had demonstrated some periods of difficult behavior over the years, yet teachers had tolerated it, still believed in him, and were concerned for his welfare when he would move on. He had shown improvement over the time as well. Peers had given him repeated chances to socialize with them when his behavior was appropriate, but discouraged his participation when his actions would have been disruptive.

Hence, it could be perceived that inclusion was taking place in Jean's situation, whereby he was a valued member of the school community, and teachers and peers were concerned for his continued well-being. Support for mandated legislation was

illustrated here, as Jean's sense of being a part of the community evolved from attending the school since kindergarten, and having been allowed to share in the daily and yearly ups-and- downs of school-life with everyone else.

In this type of an educational setting, the support of a program intervention model such as Success for All could facilitate support to learners like Jean, potentially at-risk, through the use of small instructional groupings for Language Arts and whole school involvement. The Family Intervention Support Team could provide support for Jean and others at home, or help parent(s) establish homework schedules, behavior expectations, and so on. Reading Recovery, alternatively, as was described in chapter four, would provide intensive intervention to children-at-risk in grade one, with the goal of significantly decreasing the numbers of students needing resource support in the older grades over time.

Alberta's Ecosystem

Alberta's legislation and educational trends promoted inclusion as the first alternative for the educational placement for children with special needs, however other settings were still considered as possibilities (Lister-Bauer, 1998). The experiences of 'Ian', from Alberta reflected this way of thinking. When Ian's inappropriate behaviors had escalated the previous year, he was sent to a new school, rather than having an individual program developed for him in his home school. This is in contrast to the values as designated by the Salamanca Declaration (UNESCO, 1994), which would suggest that accommodations be provided in his home school. For Ian though, it was a new start--a different setting and a new group of peers with whom he could build new and constructive friendships if he chose. As well, the special setting where he

participated for the first 5 to 6 months, had trained educators and a low student-to-teacher ratio to help Ian build on his social skills. A neighborhood school potentially would not have had this type of support available to him, so recovery may have been much slower, potentially with increased frustration and less success.

As the policies advocate an inclusive placement as the first alternative for educational placement, the focus of remediation is towards inclusion of each child into a regular setting. The school which housed the special setting which Ian was a part of had a regular program for children in kindergarten to grade six. Thus, as Ian gained confidence and improved his social skill repertoire, he was able to spend increasing amounts of time in the regular class. However, still being a member of the special class, he could return to the special setting as he felt needed to. Ian valued being a part of the regular class and having a quiet place to retreat when needed. He felt that every school should have a special setting such as the one at his school, which would be available for anyone on an as-need basis.

Alberta's policies which are termed 'permissive'may appear initially to be less 'inclusive' than provinces' which mandate inclusion in a child's neighborhood school. Yet, as illustrated through the experiences of a child, the efficacy of this approach may be highlighted. Ian was able to maintain his dignity relative to his peers, by having a quiet retreat to go to, and he was given the respect by his teachers to take the self responsibility to determine when he needed quiet time, and when he was ready to participate with his peers. Maintenance of his dignity, and the respect of teachers to encourage self responsibility would seem to reflect the values of inclusion from a

human rights perspective, providing this type of legislation and program intervention with increased credibility.

Success for All and the Reading Recovery program interventions were developed to support students academically-at-risk in inclusive settings. Hence, their efficacy to provide support in this type of a setting should be considered. Preventive in focus, they would support students in the primary grades. Potentially models such as Success for All, or Reading Recovery could function in collaboration with a special setting such as Ian's school had. Behavioral and social support would be provided in conjunction with academic intervention. Key components of the Success for All intervention could be determined, as was called for in chapter three, and implemented in a holistic manner.

Ecosystem of Brandenburg

Brandenburg's legislation and educational policies were modelled on the "Salamanca Declaration to Support Special Needs" (UNESCO, 1994), and thus supported inclusion as an ideology and philosophy to aspire towards. The narrative of Michel from Brandenburg, however, described a situation whereby support systems had not been established to support inclusion and thus it was taking place only at a physical level. Without the understanding and support, a negative experience evolved for those individuals involved.

In this situation, ironically, the policies developed to support inclusion were actually detrimental, as there was a broad gap between the readiness of the society to accept inclusion and the level of the policy development. An intermediary bridge of transition guidelines would have potentially supported the process of inclusion in a more constructive manner. Professional development and support for teachers to help

them understand the ideologies and philosophy of inclusion to which Brandenburg is committed to work towards, would link the actual practical situation with the theoretical framework.

There are many educators in Brandenburg who have had an opportunity to be educated or interact with others outside of Brandenburg who support inclusion. These educators have brought back to Brandenburg their knowledge and enthusiasm for a change in ideology which supports inclusion. Alternatively, there are many educators who have not been exposed to inclusion and carry with them the values of education as they were taught in a socialist regime. At that time, children with special needs did not attend the regular schools. Additionally, management of a regular class, and student expectations were very different than they are now (Heivepriem, personal communication, 1997). Many of these educators are still teaching, caught between their expectations based upon their previous education and values, and the changed policies and cultural changes in the expectations and behaviors of children and youth at the present time.

If a focus could be put towards professional development for teachers, with an initial focus on the evolving pedagogy and curricular development for regular learners, with gradual development towards including children with diverse learning needs, some of the strife and high student dropout currently taking place potentially could be avoided. Although this 'bridging time' of re-direction and focussing of education may seem to some financially prohibitive it could be cost-effective in the long-term.

Programs to support inclusion, such as Success for All or Reading Recovery to support learners-at-risk could be implemented in the regular schools at the present time,

if the teachers were in agreement. The Reading Recovery approach would also be effective in a special setting, where students-at-risk could receive support in a one-to-one tutoring manner.

Brandenburg may be perceived then as working towards the practice of its ideologies and beliefs of the inclusion of all children in regular schools. Inclusion is a process that takes time and a change in attitudes and practices of the majority of the people. In consideration of all that the people of Brandenburg have endured over the last sixty or so years, changes observed to be taking place demonstrate that Brandenburg is actually spiralling towards the ideology of inclusion.

Bavaria's Ecosystem

The legislation and educational policies regarding children with special needs in Bavaria, as described in chapter two, reflect a traditional cultural perspective, in which some groups of individuals with special needs are not yet fully accepted as being able to function as valuable members of their community and society (Tslamler, personal communication, 1997). Individuals with mental handicapping conditions and behavior disorders must attend school in a special setting--they do not have the right to attend a regular school. Hence, when educational policies are evaluated from a human rights perspective of inclusion, it would seem that some individuals may not be able to achieve to their true potential.

It may be questioned if Wolfgang was one of the students who, because of personal circumstances--having started school without a command of German, and having attention deficit hyperactivity disorder--would ever be able to achieve to his potential. Twelve years old, motivated, but unable to fit into a regular school setting due

to weak academic skills and difficulty in concentration, he demonstrated amazing perseverance to work towards his goal of getting a successful job.

Hence, the educational policies of Bavaria, although potentially beneficial to a highly motivated child who was eligible to attend a Gymnasium, were a hindrance for Wolfgang, as he was unable to move ahead to another level of schooling, and instead experienced frustration and boredom in a Hauptschule setting.

At a program level, the Success for All or Reading Recovery intervention programs could provide support to children in the regular schools academically at-risk. Potentially some of these children could get a ' boost' to help them accelerate, so that they could meet the criteria in grade four to qualify to attend a Gymnasium and be eligible to attend University, rather than a Realeschule where the only option is to learn a trade. As well, if children such as Wolfgang who attend the Special Schools had access to this type of support it seems likely that some of them would demonstrate significant academic and behavioral improvements, and potentially be able to succeed in a regular setting.

Summary

The goal of the section above was to demonstrate the impact of the legislations regarding individuals with special needs upon the nature of the experiences of children within each state/province, As well, the two program level interventions, Success for All and Reading Recovery, developed to support children at risk, were discussed with reference to their ability to support children in various settings. The components of each ecosystem--from provincial/state level policies, through program interventions, to

children's experiences--may then be linked into their system levels, thus forming an ecosystem framework of inclusion.

## Implications for Learning and Teaching

Brofenbrenner (1979) was one of the first theorists to promote a social-systems approach to understanding behavior. This approach suggests that an individual's behavior can best be understood by considering the context in which it occurs, and the influence of members of that system. That system, potentially family or school-based, is influenced in turn by other social systems through to a local, provincial or potentially national policy-based level. In simpler terms, an ecosystems approach views a child's behavior or learning as being influenced--positively or negatively, directly and indirectly--by the people and the values of the culture which he/she is a part of. If there is a conflict between the child's behavior and the expectations of the system then, it is not necessarily the role of the child to make a change. If a component of the environment can be changed, then perhaps that is the appropriate measure to take. Hence, the child is not necessarily perceived as being in the wrong. One may suggest that potentially, the other members--parents, teachers, or peers--should be the ones to make a change.

An ecosystems approach provides a broad-based framework which encourages an eclectic approach to child intervention, and allows one to view the situation in a more holistic manner. For example, the impact of a child's home life on his performance from a short- and a long-term perspective may be validated in an ecological-based assessment. Previously, a teacher or psychologist may have been aware of certain factors, but their impact was not given formal recognition. Recognition

of the impact of external systems on a child's performance may shed a very different perspective on how a child's performance would be viewed if these systems did not have an effect on the child. As teachers then, we need to be sensitive to children as individuals, and to possible factors outside of the school system that we have no knowledge or control over, which may be having an effect on their lives for the short or long term. When a situation is encountered where it is perceived that a child's actions are not appropriate, prior to determining that the child has demonstrated inappropriate behavior, a teacher needs to be able to 'take a step back' and observe the whole situation.

Chapter five described the narratives of four students with identified behavior disorders, who demonstrated off-task behavior at times. The students described how teachers had dealt with their off-task behaviors. Typically the students had been blamed and consequences of varied severity reflected this message.

What would the long-term results for the child be if he/she was not given a consequence such as above, but instead, a teacher sought as a goal to gain greater understanding of the nature of attention deficit disorder and how to help a child learn to gain self-control? Increased understanding and sensitivity to the difficulties encountered by the child as he attempted to maintain concentration, and sit quietly may facilitate a teacher to make a change in instructional methods, or seating arrangements in the classroom. If the teacher decided to try to help the child learn self-regulation skills, it could be the first step towards successful inclusion for that child. Contact would likely be made with the parents. Potentially, the effects of learning about a constructive long-

term intervention to be initiated at school could positively affect the dynamics of the ecosystem at home.

The plan above describes an action sequence which based on evaluation of a situation or conflict from an ecological perspective--whereby the changes needed to minimize the conflict would not necessarily be directed at the child. The anticipated results of the multi-faceted intervention would be positive as; (a) the child would have a much greater sense of being valued in the class community, which could result in improved concentration and performance, (b) the teacher would feel much better about her own teaching abilities and relationships with the children, as well as other educators and parents, (c) likely over time she would be more comfortable with inclusion, and (d) social learning and acceptance of diversity would likely improve in the classroom.

A key point here is that the teacher did not need a lot of theoretical information about the nature of the disability, inclusion, or the child's rights to be in her class. Hypothetically she was provided with information about behavioral disorders and the nature of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, and subsequently she utilized effective methods to initiate an action plan to try to deal with the source of the conflict. The teacher had determined that rather than blaming the child, which subsequently was ineffective in effecting change, she would utilize an ecological approach to try to understand the whole situation more effectively.

The relationship between a teacher and each of her students has been documented as being the essence from which students will be motivated and enthusiastic to learn. This relationship represents a dyad of interactions which must demonstrate mutual respect and caring by both the teacher and learners. If these values

are demonstrated and followed, this relationship should be a powerful catalyst for each student, particularly those at-risk to show increased self-reliance and confidence. Following that, a dramatic improvement in performance could take place as the child is increasingly willing to risk-take, and try tasks with increased demands and difficulty. Hence, teachers need to be conscious of the impact of their words and actions upon children's perceived competence and self-esteem, and to also be sensitive to, and acknowledge their students' backgrounds, values, and expectations.

## Humanism and Inclusion in Teacher Education

Ironically perhaps, because the spontaneous sharing of humanistic values may have been perceived to have been lost, we have mandated humanism and human rights for all through 'inclusion', and expected effective and caring instruction to take place. Students' narratives presented in Chapter five suggested however, that true inclusion does not necessarily mean full physical inclusion.

Teacher education program models have been and continue to be developed and modified with the goal of providing becoming-teachers, and educators in the field with the knowledge and skills to be able to include children with special needs in regular classrooms. Yet, it has been documented that although becoming teachers may articulate a belief about adapting classrooms with response to students' readiness, interests, and learning profiles, frequently they have not been able to do so (McAlpine, Brown, McIntyre, & Hagger, 1988; Ysseldyke & Algonzzine, 1995). The becoming-teachers suggested that they needed increased emphasis on differentiated instruction in each of their curriculum content courses, and that they needed more examples of how differentiation would look in practice. Educators in the field have noted concern about

meaningful outcomes for students with special needs who have been placed in their regular classes (Spaulding, 1992). As Spaulding noted, if teachers begin to doubt their own ability to meet the challenges they will face with students with varied abilities, then their effectiveness may be compromised, and students-at-risk would be at particular risk in their classes.

In order for becoming-teachers, and some educators in the field to feel comfortable in accepting the responsibility of educating children with varied abilities in their classrooms, some additional or alternative elements need to be focussed on, in teacher education programs, and inservices. In the previous section, the emphasis was placed upon the utilization of an ecological framework for a teacher to be able to see the situation in a holistic manner. The action plan was based on effective teaching strategies that may be used for any child, not only those with severe behavioral needs. As well, the teacher was able to perceive how she had reacted previously, possibly triggered by fatigue or other factors.

Could this framework be utilized in a more structured manner, to help teachers be able to look at the 'whole' picture of each child? Would it facilitate teachers to be able to self-reflect about their own fears or ambiguities regarding children with special needs, and their ability to teach them? Would increased collaboration with other teachers, professionals, and parents potentially enhance their knowledge about a child's abilities, and learning needs? Increasingly, collaboration and reflective conversation is being seen as a sign of a healthy educational setting (Goodlad, 1994). As teachers are able to share and reflect upon 'what works', they may gain personal support, and be

able to see a situation from another perspective, without feeling threatened or inadequate in being able to meet the needs of every child in their classroom.

It is likely that most teacher education programs include elements of guided reflection, times for teacher collaboration and discussion of vignettes. Sometimes potentially, some of these experiences have been provided informally, while other topics have been presented formally, with increased emphasis and time. Yet, teachers must be comfortable in including and valuing all children, if inclusion is to take place. They must believe that they are capable of providing all children with an effective learning experience, and facilitating harmony and respect amongst the students. Then, and only then, need they think about the specifics of each child's abilities, curriculum content and pedagogy.

Becoming teachers need to learn the skills and knowledge, as they have been doing. However, in some settings, increased time needs to be made to incorporate specific affective elements of the teaching and learning dyad into the teacher education programs, to illustrate to becoming teachers that they are a key player in the ecological framework of inclusion. When they can feel confident about their own abilities to facilitate effective learning experiences for all children, then they will be able to do so. Then the elements of humanism and caring will evolve naturally, as teachers are able to build a nurturing learning environment for every child in their class.

## Summary of Ideas, Ideals, and Future Directions

In summary, an ecosystems framework provided an opportunity to gain an understanding of the educational process regarding students with special needs in four differing cultural and educational environments. Evaluation of the multi-faceted process

was broken down conceptually, to be able to infer the impact of a society's educational policies and values on the educational situations. A cross-cultural perspective facilitated an increased awareness from which to evaluate and compare the educational values, and services.

It appears as though physical inclusion is the program model which has been used for the basis of educational programming for quite some time. However, teachers are advocating for increased training, support, equipment, and materials. Many elements are needed to facilitate successful inclusion. These elements include, but are not limited to the following: (a) research to evaluate the efficacy of representative programs claiming inclusion, (b) teacher-training programs to be accountable for their content, focus, and practical information about including children with diverse needs, and (c) studies to determine common events or factors (if any) which have influenced teachers in the area of special needs to become 'inclusive' in their thinking, and teacher practices.

It is anticipated that with an increased focus in teacher education on humanistic issues and awareness of a global education perspective, becoming-teachers and teacher educators may be increasingly sensitive to the varied needs of learners today. The use of an ecological approach, including the teacher as a component of the system, along with guided reflection would facilitate ownership and awareness of the teachers' role and influence in the teaching process. Facilitated collaboration with a multi-disciplinary membership, development of teamwork and understanding of cooperative learning situations in order to implement these activities effectively in the classroom would empower and enable teachers to offer all of their students the foundation of a classroom

community. It is hoped that true inclusion, "a sense of belonging" and respect as an important member of the classroom community would and will then be felt by all students as they experience school.

## References

Alexander, J. (1983). Teaching reading. Boston, Mass: Little, Brown & Company.

Briggs, L. (1987). Poor attitude: A deterrent to reading improvement. Reading Horizens, spring, 1987, 202-208.

Brofenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dean, C. (1992) Parent-caregiver partnerships: Communication for parents and child care providers. Ithaca NY: Cornell University.

Goodlad, J.(1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

McAlpine, Brown, S., McIntyre, D., & Hagger, K. (1998). Student teachers learning from experienced teachers. Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Spaulding, L. (1992). Motivation in the Classroom. New York: McGraw Hill.

Ysseldyke, J. & Algozzine, B. (1995). Special Education: A practical approach for teachers ( 3rd ed.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin.